



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 24, 2007

No. 119

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COHEN).

tempore (Mrs. DAVIS of California) at 10 a.m.

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 24, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE COHEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

### PRAYER

Reverend Galen E. Hahn, Evangelical United Church of Christ, Portsmouth, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Laus Deo. Praise be to God. Our elected Representatives, O God, work diligently on this day to represent the interests and the needs of the many peoples of this land. Holding a people together as one has been a challenge to former leaders of this land.

May our congressional leaders be guided throughout their many efforts this day by the words of Washington's prayer that we all be disposed to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before You, O God.

Saving grace, we know, is not simply a personal attainment apart from community responsibility. It is also community accomplishment expressed in thankfulness to the Source from which it comes.

Bless our leaders this day with thankfulness in their hearts. May their lives and their leadership give praise to You, O God. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DUNCAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1856. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to make technical corrections to the new border tunnels and passages of-fense.

### WELCOMING REVEREND GALEN HAHN

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend Reverend Galen Hahn, who is serving as guest chaplain for the House of Representatives today.

Reverend Hahn is the pastor of the Evangelical United Church of Christ, located in my district in Portsmouth, Ohio. Reverend Galen Hahn graduated from Frederick High School in Maryland. As a high school student, Reverend Hahn led youth in contributing to the building of the President John F. Kennedy Library and served as an usher on the Presidential Reviewing Stand of Lyndon B. Johnson. After high school Reverend Hahn went on to graduate from Yale Divinity School in Connecticut and was ordained a minister in the United Church of Christ.

Reverend Hahn has pastored throughout the country. He has offered ordained Christian service to the Moravian Church and the United Methodist Church in North Carolina and started a Montessori preschool in Illinois, which continues to this day. He has led scouts in worship on the battlefields of Monocacy, Antietam, and Gettysburg, and has held a memorial service at the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8297

grave site of President George Washington.

Galen's wife Sandy has led worship at Camp David for President and Mrs. George Herbert Walker Bush. Today Galen and Sandy are celebrating their 36th wedding anniversary as well as their oldest daughter Whitney's 30th birthday.

Reverend Hahn has invested his life's energy in service to God and country and the oneness of these two entities.

Madam Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in welcoming Reverend Galen Hahn to the House of Representatives as our guest chaplain.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the House that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

#### THE FARM BILL

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the farm bill in its current form is a missed opportunity to strengthen family farms while reforming American agriculture. The bill coming out of committee is absolutely the least that can be done.

Long overdue support for specialty crops is welcome, but a relative drop in the bucket in terms of overall agricultural spending. Conservation is honored more in word than deed, and the massive payments to the wealthiest few farmers are virtually unrestricted. The new adjusted gross income limit of \$900,000 is almost meaningless, the proof being that it only saves a few million dollars. There is no meaningful limit on rice and cotton farmers, and it sweetens the outrageous deal for Big Sugar. It is sad that it continues to shortchange the family farm, forcing them to compete with heavily subsidized large operators who will continue to buy them out, making it harder for most farmers to make a living.

Luckily for people who eat and people who farm, there still is a chance for reform. And I urge my colleagues to carefully examine the bipartisan amendment from Congressmen KIND, FLAKE, and RYAN.

#### CONCRETE PROGRESS IN NORTH KOREA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, last Tuesday the Post and Courier of Charleston, South Carolina, editorialized: "After more than 5 years of impasse and hostility, the patient multinational diplomacy launched by President Bush has borne its first fruit in North Korea. The intricate deal reached last spring for a path to a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula is advancing with the shutdown of a reactor that produces plutonium for the dictatorship's nuclear weapons program."

"It signals that North Korea is committed, so far, to a step-by-step bettering of relations with its neighbors and particularly with the United States. The shutdown was confirmed by the International Atomic Energy Agency."

In 2003, I participated in a rare delegation visiting Pyongyang, and I am grateful that "the six-nation framework devised by Mr. Bush and ably hosted by China . . . has led to the current progress." I saw firsthand where North Korea can benefit by opening its economy.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th and the Glasgow airport attack.

#### THE WORKERS OF THE GREATER NEW ORLEANS AREA AND THE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

(Mr. JEFFERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JEFFERSON. Madam Speaker, the workers of the greater New Orleans area, in large part, are hospitality industry workers. These hardworking men and women greet the world with wide smiles and warm embraces as they welcome millions of tourists and conference attendees to the metropolitan New Orleans area. These workers make sure that the hotel rooms, the restaurants, and other places of rest and recreation are clean, safe, and comfortable.

But behind this public veneer lies another story, a story of the difficult lives of the working poor. These hardworking people never have a chance to take a vacation for themselves, or attend a conference, or benefit from the delights that they make it possible for their city and region to offer. Their wages never crack the poverty level. They are not unionized and have few, if any, job benefits.

So I rise today to applaud the work of this Congress, this new majority, for taking a big step in the right direction by increasing the minimum wage. For the low-wage workers in my area, it means that the nightmare of the single longest stretch in our Nation's history without a minimum wage increase is ending. It means that many of the workers in our area will have a little more food on the table, a little more in the way of resources to house and care for their families, and a lot more dignity.

For this, we thank this Congress.

#### PLANNED DEFEAT

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the war in Iraq is the most difficult and important issue facing our Nation today. The stakes there are simply too high for us to ignore the consequences of failure. Most military analysts agree that an arbitrary immediate withdrawal from Iraq would spiral that country and the surrounding region into chaos.

Failing to secure Iraq will provide a fertile ground for terrorist actions that affect not only Iraq, but America and the rest of the free world. Extremist organizations will tout an American retreat as a major victory for terrorism. Once again saying that America doesn't ever have the stomach to finish a war. Terrorist leaders will make use of a fractured Iraq to train, equip, and provide sanctuary for their forces in much the same way that Afghanistan provided a haven for the Taliban and al Qaeda. Radicals will exploit the anarchy and abandon Iraq and will seek to spread jihadist movements to moderate Arab States. Arbitrary withdrawal will only encourage our enemy.

War is hard, but a planned defeat by retreat is hardly an answer to success. And that's just the way it is.

#### SCHIP

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, Republicans and Democrats throughout the Nation agree no child in our Nation should go without health care. In States across the country, Democratic and Republican Governors have supported strengthening the Children's Health Insurance Program. In the Senate, Republicans have come forward and said they support the Democratic plan to give millions of children health care.

Now the only question is whether our Republican colleagues here in the House will join our effort to give 10 million children the care they need and deserve. Remember, this is the same guarantee our own children have. The kids of Congress men and women get the health care they need and the health care they deserve. The question is are we going to provide that for our constituents' children?

The Children's Health Insurance Program has broad bipartisan political support, and we are on the brink of providing 10 million children that quality care. That is millions of children who will be able to see a doctor they deserve when they are sick. And it is millions of children and their families who aren't interested in our political battles or political posturing that won't heal a sick child or give them comfort when they are ill.

Republican Senators have stepped forward. Now the children across America and their parents are waiting on this Congress to act. And the question is, will this Congress give our constituents' children the same health care that their own children have?

#### DUTY CALLS US TO BE MORE THAN "SUNSHINE PATRIOTS"

(Mr. AKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, during the War of Independence, Paine said: "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from service of their country . . ."

America is again at war, and duty calls us to be more than sunshine patriots.

I have been to Iraq. My son is a Marine captain who has been in Fallujah.

We have heard on the Armed Services Committee from scores of witnesses, liberals and conservatives and everything in between, and no one has offered a plan that is better than what we are currently executing in Iraq, and everyone agrees that a rapid withdrawal of troops will result in civil war and a regional conflict.

If the Democrats have a better plan, let them offer it. Otherwise, let our troops get the job done.

It is politically popular to sound retreat and to play the sunshine patriot, but duty, honor, and country demand that America stand for freedom once again. We must accept nothing less.

#### URGING REAUTHORIZATION OF SCHIP

(Mr. ALTMIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, today House Democrats unveiled the Children's Health and Medicare Protection Act. It was endorsed by the National Governors Association, a bipartisan group of our Nation's Governors, who just last week asked us for urgent action to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program.

The SCHIP program that we are reauthorizing will ensure that millions of children have access to high-quality, cost-effective health insurance, and it will protect and strengthen the Medicare Trust Fund.

Now, while the President's budget underfunded this program, knocking 1 million children off of the rolls of the SCHIP program, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in a bipartisan effort to show support for the SCHIP program and reauthorize and support the Children's Health and Medicare Protection Act.

□ 1015

#### PROTECT LAKE MICHIGAN FROM BP DUMPING

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Today, bipartisan Representatives from Illinois will meet with Bob Malone, the chairman of BP North America. Why? Because Mr. Malone and his team want to increase their dumping of ammonia and suspended solids in our drinking water, Lake Michigan.

BP hired a consultant who told them what they wanted to hear, that despite being one of the most profitable companies on Earth and spending \$3 billion to upgrade their Indiana refinery, they can't find the space to prevent dumping in Lake Michigan.

This morning, the House will take up a bipartisan resolution condemning BP's plan to dump in Lake Michigan. I hope that BP will tell us today that they are reconsidering their plans. I hope they hear the voices of 2,700 Americans in my district that signed a petition against the BP dumping plan. I hope they hear the voice of 19 Republicans and Democrats that asked the EPA to pull the permit.

BP should hear the voice of the House this morning. If not, BP has to understand that our action this morning is only the opening step by action in the Congress to protect Lake Michigan.

#### DEMOCRATS' EFFORT TO INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE IS PART OF BROADER ECONOMIC AGENDA

(Mr. ARCURI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, today marks the first time in a decade that those hardworking workers who earn minimum wage will receive a pay raise. Today, around the Nation, workers who have been paid \$5.15 for 10 years will finally get a boost in their pay. This wage increase will directly benefit low-income workers who need it most.

We should never forget that most minimum wage workers are adults who work to support themselves and their families, and many are single mothers who must work several jobs to make ends meet. And while some at the very top are primarily benefiting from the supposed economic recovery, most workers have seen very little economic progress. Average real wages are lower today than they were in 2001, even though productivity is up by 13 percent.

Madam Speaker, this wage increase is a great concrete step by the new Democratic-led Congress toward a broader agenda that will help us not only grow our economy, but ensure that every American benefits from that growth.

#### HONORING CHASKA, MINNESOTA FOR BEING NAMED ONE OF TOP TEN BEST PLACES TO LIVE

(Mr. KLINE of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the community of Chaska, located southwest of the Twin Cities, and a town I'm proud to say is part of Minnesota's Second Congressional District.

Money magazine confirmed what many of us in the great State of Minnesota already knew by naming Chaska as one of the top 10 best places to live in America. Money magazine accurately describes Chaska as having both beauty and brains. A stroll downtown Chaska by City Square Park brings to life images from Norman Rockwell paintings, depicting all that is good about small town America. Chaska's small 19th-century downtown quickly yields to open fields, farmland and the Minnesota River. It is also home to innovation, with more than a dozen technology and biotech companies. It is no wonder why this town is a magnet for families who can find reasonably priced homes, low taxes and quality schools.

Congratulations again to the entire community of Chaska for earning this prestigious distinction. We in Minnesota's Second District are proud.

#### RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, in this body, where we often discuss proposals to allocate millions or billions of dollars, it can become easy to lose sight of what just a few thousand dollars a year can do. But the increase in the minimum wage, the first part of which takes effect today, will make a major difference in the lives of America's working families. The extra \$4.400 per year that these families will bring home to their families will have a very tangible impact on their lives.

For families who have struggled too long without a raise, \$4,400 a year translates into 15 months of groceries, 19 months of paid utility bills, 20 months of child care, or well over 2 years of employer-provided health care. The extra money could even pay for 30 months of tuition at a public 2-year college, allowing these parents to get additional education or to help their children achieve their dream of attending college.

Madam Speaker, thanks to the Federal minimum wage increase passed by this Democratic Congress, nearly 13 million working Americans and more than 6 million children will have a chance at a better life. This fair and long overdue pay raise is an important first step in moving our Nation in a new economically healthy direction.

### ARBITRARY FUEL STANDARDS COST JOBS—DON'T SAVE ENERGY

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, 30 years ago, Congress established CAFE standards to lower our dependence on foreign oil. And the cost? Hundreds of billions of dollars to comply with the regulation, hundreds of thousands of auto jobs lost, and dependence on foreign oil has gone up over 100 percent.

CAFE has not worked. It's an antiquated model, and we should be pursuing new technologies instead. But Democratic leaders are pushing even more stringent CAFE. Democrats are telling auto companies to produce more hybrids and other unprofitable vehicles to comply with new regulations.

A recent JD Power survey shows consumer demand is dropping for hybrids, forcing costly incentives to move these expensive vehicles. Even Honda is discontinuing its Accord hybrid because of poor sales.

If we worked with the domestic auto industry to develop leap-ahead technologies and make them affordable for all consumers instead of overregulating, we could achieve breakthroughs to reach our goals and to protect American jobs, but instead, the Democratic leadership has made a conscious decision to bankrupt Michigan.

### RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, when the Democrats won control of Congress in November, we committed to raising the minimum wage for the first time in 10 years and to provide tax relief to our small businesses.

Today's increase in the Federal minimum wage marks a concrete step that this new Congress is taking to provide greater opportunity and prosperity for all working Americans. The considerable small business tax relief that was passed along with the minimum wage increase reflects a broader American agenda to expand our economy and give small businesses more room to grow and succeed. This relief includes allowing small businesses larger tax reductions, making it easier to expand and provide better services, and specific relief from the AMT.

I am proud that the State of New York has already been a leader in providing workers with a living wage, and the raise that goes into effect today will put our businesses in New York on a level playing field with the rest of the country.

### HONORING MARYVILLE INTER- MEDIATE SCHOOL SIXTH GRADE WIND ENSEMBLE BAND

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a fine group of sixth graders from my district in Tennessee. The Maryville Intermediate School Sixth Grade Wind Ensemble Band from Maryville, Tennessee, is headed to Chicago for the prestigious 2007 Midwest Clinic, an international band and orchestra concert.

The event is known in band and orchestra circles as one of the highest honors a musical group can receive. They were chosen to participate only after an extensive audition process in which they competed against other bands and orchestras from high schools, communities, colleges and universities and militaries from around the world.

This is certainly a great achievement in and of itself. But the Maryville band is special in another way; they are the first sixth grade band in the Clinic's 61-year history to be invited to participate. It is an honor that the close-knit community of Maryville can be proud of, and just another example of the incredible spirit of the people of east Tennessee.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to join me as I salute Maryville Intermediate School's Wind Ensemble Band and its directors, George Hayden and RoAnn Romines, on this much-deserved accomplishment. I wish them many more musical scores to come.

### RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, today, for the first time in a decade, America's minimum wage workers are getting a pay raise.

The minimum wage increase would never have happened had not congressional Democrats made it one of their top priorities when we came to Capitol Hill at the beginning of this year.

During our first 100 hours, House Democrats passed this much-deserved pay raise with the support of 82 congressional Republicans. As health care and groceries and energy and housing costs skyrocket for the average consumer, for many years these needs were ignored for millions of Americans.

And every day the minimum wage was not raised, it lost its value. As a matter of fact, the minimum wage was at its lowest level in inflation-adjusted terms since 1955. This is simply not fair, and that's why the new Democratic Congress has made increasing the minimum wage one of its top priorities. And with this increase today, Madam Speaker, Democrats are deliv-

ering on the promise that we made to the American people.

### PROVIDING A SECURE ENERGY FUTURE

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, we must find ways to be less reliant on foreign supplies of oil and gas. And this is more than an energy issue; this is a national security issue. We cannot be beholden to our enemies for our energy supply. But the good news is we're making progress domestically to find a diverse energy supply using alternative energy sources.

South Carolina, which is becoming a front-runner in alternative energy for the Nation, received \$1 million to fund cellulosic ethanol process development. These funds will support a bioethanol project that Clemson University, SC Bio, Savannah River National Lab and the Queensland University of Technology collaborated on using novel technology.

The time is now to provide a secure energy future for generations to come. And fortunately, we are working domestically to ensure that ethanol technology here at home is a permanent fix to solving our dependency on foreign energy sources.

### MILITARY FAMILIES AND THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, today, many American families will finally receive a long overdue pay raise when phase one of the Federal minimum wage increase takes effect.

It has been 10 long years since American workers have seen an increase in the Federal minimum wage, the longest gap in the history of the law. Over that decade, inflation has all but erased the effect of the last increase, leaving millions of families, including military families, struggling to survive.

Currently, Madam Speaker, 10 percent of military spouses earn between \$5.15 and \$7.25 an hour. These 50,000 military families are part of the nearly 13 million Americans who will benefit from the Federal minimum wage increase that takes effect today.

Madam Speaker, increasing the minimum wage is just one part of a broader American agenda to strengthen the economy and help working families. Democrats believe that all Americans, not just the privileged few, deserve to make a living wage.

I am proud that we passed this legislation, and especially glad that it will help so many of our military families.

**“HOLD ON TO YOUR WALLET  
CONGRESS” IS AT IT AGAIN**

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I know this is beginning to sound like a broken record, but the “Hold on to Your Wallet Congress” is at it again.

In today’s latest episode, the liberal leadership has proposed another spending bill that will most likely be dead on arrival when it hits the President’s desk because it shows disrespect for the taxpayers’ dollar.

The Democrat Transportation-HUD spending bill provides for a whopping \$104.4 billion in spending for the next fiscal year, which is more than \$4 billion in new spending and more than \$2.8 billion above what the President requested.

The legislation increases spending for earmarks. And it does fail to address the very real solvency issues of the highway trust fund, which will face a \$4 billion shortfall in 2009.

The bill is irresponsible, sets the wrong priorities, and adds to the already staggering level of additional new spending in the 110th Congress.

The current Congress pledged to curb runaway spending, but instead they have moved it to the fast lane and they’ve set the pedal to the metal to see how fast they can spend your dollar.

**INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE**

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I am proud that today many Americans will receive their first pay raise in a decade because the Fair Minimum Wage Act passed by the Democratic Congress goes into effect.

These hardworking Americans, 40 percent of whom are minorities, will receive a 70-cents-per-hour raise today, which will be followed by two more 70-cent increases in July 2008 and July 2009. This will result in a total of \$2.10 increase, or \$4,400 a year. This boost in pay will make a significant difference in the lives of these American families who are trying to survive on a minimum wage that has reached its lowest effective level in more than half a century. It means more food on their tables, better health care for their families, and a shot at sending their children to college.

Everyone who works full time should have the chance to achieve these pieces of the American Dream. And with this increase in minimum wage which begins today, they can.

I am proud to be a part of the Democratic Congress that passed this long overdue pay raise for millions of hardworking Americans. I want to note

that my home State of New Jersey led the way in an increase in minimum wage. Our minimum wage is already \$7.15 an hour, and that rate was effective since October 2006.

**AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF  
CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS**

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I send a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 190) to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

□ 1030

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution, please.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this concurrent resolution provides for printing additional copies of three congressional publications that our constituents frequently request from us and of which supplies are nearly exhausted. Two of the publications are about the U.S. Constitution. With Constitution Day, September 17, approaching fast, we need to replenish our supplies so that Members can fulfill the requests from schools, civic organizations and others.

Madam Speaker, I know of no controversy and urge an “aye” vote.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, under my reservation, I would simply comment that these are remarkably good documents. We make great use of them in the United States. Frankly, I would like to see the dollar limit removed, because these are very valuable documents for students in the schools. I know we receive many, many requests for them, frequently more than we can handle.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support the resolution with the one reservation that I wish we could increase the allocation; however, I don’t want to stop the flow of democracy here.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 190

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—An edition of the brochure entitled “How Our Laws Are Made”, as revised under the direction of the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives in consultation with the Parliamentarian of the Senate, shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 550,000 copies of the document, of which 440,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$479,247, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

**SEC. 2. DOCUMENT-SIZED, ANNOTATED UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 2007 edition of the document-sized, annotated version of the United States Constitution shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 550,000 copies of the document, of which 440,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$535,853, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

**SEC. 3. POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 23rd edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 550,000 copies of the document, of which 440,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$188,462, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

The current resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

**EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE DUMPING OF INDUSTRIAL WASTE INTO THE GREAT LAKES**

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to

the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 187) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the dumping of industrial waste into the Great Lakes.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 187

Whereas the Great Lakes are the largest surface freshwater system on the planet;

Whereas the Great Lakes account for 95 percent of the United States' surface fresh water and about 21 percent of the world's supply;

Whereas the Great Lakes provide drinking water for more than 30 million Americans;

Whereas, on May 18, 2004, President George W. Bush said "the Great Lakes are a national treasure";

Whereas Congress has expressed its commitment to protecting the Great Lakes from pollutants and contaminants through the Clean Water Act and subsequent legislation;

Whereas the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Environment Canada joined together in promulgating the Great Lakes Binational Toxics Strategy to eliminate the presence of persistent toxic substances in the Great Lakes basin;

Whereas the "mixing zones" that dilute toxic chemicals discharged into the Great Lakes system have been controversial as a possible threat to humans, fish and wildlife;

Whereas the Great Lakes are plagued by pollutants such as mercury, PCBs, ammonia, DDT, alkylated lead, hexachlorobenzene, TCDD, toxaphene, and others;

Whereas high amounts of ammonia can cause algae blooms that threaten fish and water quality;

Whereas the Indiana Department of Environmental Management recently issued a permit to BP PLC to allow their facility in Whiting, IN, to release 54 percent more ammonia and 35 percent more total suspended solids into Lake Michigan each day;

Whereas the BP Whiting facility will now be allowed to dump an average of 1,584 pounds of ammonia and 4,925 pounds of total suspended solids daily into Lake Michigan;

Whereas the Great Lakes already face myriad challenges from chemicals and pollutants, including a steep increase in fish consumption warnings and record numbers of beach closures; and

Whereas Congress has a clear role in protecting the Great Lakes as an entity that spans across State and international boundaries: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—*

(1) Congress expresses its disapproval of the Indiana Department of Environmental Management's issuance of a permit allowing BP to increase their daily dumping of ammonia and total suspended solids into Lake Michigan;

(2) Congress urges the State of Indiana to reconsider issuance of a permit allowing BP to increase their daily dumping of ammonia and total suspended solids into Lake Michigan;

(3) Congress should take action to protect and restore the Great Lakes;

(4) the United States Environmental Protection Agency's actions in the Great Lakes basin should be consistent with the goal of preserving and restoring the Great Lakes; and

(5) the United States Environmental Protection Agency should not allow increased dumping of chemicals and pollutants into the Great Lakes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we are gathered here to commemorate two extraordinary events. Forty years ago, the Cuyahoga River en route to Lake Erie caught fire and galvanized the attention of a Nation and the action of Congress to strengthen the Federal Water Pollution Control Act resulting in the Clean Water Act of 1972.

You would have thought that the Nation had learned its lesson with the Cuyahoga River incident and the other tragedies that befell the Great Lakes over the years; the invasion of lamprey eel and subsequent nonindigenous invasive species, and other tragedies, such as industrial dumping, that nearly resulted in the death of Lake Erie.

But here we are gathered, 40 years later, to face a report from the Chicago Tribune that the regulators in the State of Indiana have given permission for BP, one of the world's largest energy companies, to release half more ammonia than they are and one-third more sludge into Lake Michigan each day.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) sprang to the defense of Lake Michigan, as have numerous of our colleagues that are gathered here with us today, and mobilized a resolution that we have under consideration today.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota, who has been a leader on the Great Lakes issue, and also my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because this issue is not a Democratic or a Republican issue; it is an issue between right and wrong.

British Petroleum, who is now seeking to expand their refinery capacity in Indiana, has run advertising campaigns all over the country that they are "beyond petroleum." If they are allowed to dump more ammonia and mercury and other metals into the Great Lakes, BP's "beyond petroleum" will become standard for "big polluter."

I say that not just as a way to embarrass them, although I hope it accomplishes that goal. They have the capacity to live up to what they are advertising; that they are a company that is sensitive to the environment.

Thirty-seven million Americans now get their daily drinking water from the Great Lakes. It is the largest body of fresh water in North America. It contains 20 percent of the world's freshwater supply. It is the economic heart of the Midwest.

As my colleague Mr. OBERSTAR noted, the fire at the Cuyahoga River

and on Lake Erie galvanized the country. When I was growing up, prior to that bill, we used to run past the dead fish, dive into Lake Michigan, and swim 30 or 40 feet past all the dead fish to pop up. The Clean Water Act improved dramatically the environmental standard of Lake Michigan, Lake Erie, Lake Superior, Lake Ontario and all the Great Lakes. The question here is, are we going to move forward, or are we going to go back?

What is ironic about all of this is that this issue isn't about technology. They can do the refining to clean up and make sure that we don't dump ammonia and mercury and other environmental hazards into the lake. The question here is not technology or money. They are spending \$3.8 billion to expand this facility, which is a good thing to do, because it will help on the energy supply.

The question is they said they don't have the land mass to deal with it. They have 2.6 square miles there. If you look on the Google map, you can see the size of what they have. It is 1,600 acres. They have the land capacity to do this.

Now, I compliment British Petroleum on one other issue. They brought Democrats and Republicans together on a single issue. They are a uniter, not a divider. Usually we are divided here on other issues, so I want to compliment BP for having brought Democrats and Republicans together in a unique act of bipartisanship realizing that Lake Michigan and other Great Lakes deserve our support.

We have made great progress. The question before us is whether BP will live not only up to their advertising, but what this Congress has committed to do, and every Congress has committed to do for the last 30 years, is that when it comes to our lakes, our drinking waters, whether we are going to go forward or backward.

I would hope that BP would take this notion that what they are seeing today on the floor is the beginning of a pressure, and that they realize that the decision they make, they can do the right thing. I think every one of us knows that if they made a decision to expand their refinery with the environmental qualities, every one of us would put a resolution on the floor the next day praising them for that decision.

So they have the choice: We will join them and say that they are right. They are a company that literally puts their money where their mouth is. Are they "beyond petroleum," or will they be the company known as the "big polluter"? They have a choice.

I want to thank my colleague from Minnesota for having this resolution on the floor and taking the leadership and the time to commit to this.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this issue before us first came to my attention 9 days ago in a July 15 story published in the Chicago Tribune entitled "BP Gets Break

Dumping in Lake." Shortly after that I went into a meeting which Mr. OBERSTAR was chairing, and I alerted him to the issue, because I know he loves the Great Lakes as much as I do.

That article highlighted the wastewater discharge permit granted by the State of Indiana to British Petroleum for its refinery facility in Whiting, Indiana, on the shores of Lake Michigan. The new permit allows BP to discharge an average of 1,584 pounds of ammonia per day, up from 1,030 pounds per day, a 54 percent increase above the old limit. The new permit also allows BP to discharge 4,925 pounds of total suspended solids per day, up from 3,646 pounds per day, a 35 percent increase. This level of discharge is extremely disconcerting to me and the entire Great Lakes region.

Let me provide a little background information. The BP facility in Whiting was built in 1889 by John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil Company. Today, it is the fourth largest refinery in the country. It employs 1,700 people and supports another 1,500 contract workers in producing gasoline, diesel and jet fuel. It is a major, major refining operation not just in northwest Indiana, but, indeed, the entire Midwest.

BP plans to spend more than \$3 billion in upgrading and expanding the facility so it can process more heavy crude from Canada. I support the expansion of refinery capacity to help address our immediate and pressing need for fuel in the Midwest, but I know that the switch to refining more Canadian crude will inevitably lead to more waste from the facility.

No one is accusing BP of subverting the regulatory process. The permit went through the regular public comment period, although I must say that the time between the notice and the final issuance seems to me a very short period for a project of this magnitude. According to the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, the permit was issued in full accordance and compliance with State and Federal environmental laws. If that is true, and I don't doubt that it is, there is something wrong with State and Federal environmental laws.

The benefits of this project should not come at the expense of our most precious natural resource. The Great Lakes are the world's largest freshwater system and serve as a source of drinking water, food, jobs and recreation for more than 40 million Americans. It is critical that we enhance our restoration efforts for this vital resource. It is already polluted enough, and we certainly do not want to degrade the condition of the lakes even further.

All the communities and States around the lakes have tried to improve their practices. My own town, my city of Grand Rapids, Michigan, has spent several hundred million dollars improving its wastewater treatment system to help clean up the lake, and that is the story in many cities around the lakes.

President Bush 2 years ago issued an Executive Order calling together the mayors and the Governors of the Great Lakes regions, the Members of Congress, the environmentalists and the tribes to work together to develop a solution to the pollution in the lakes. Over 1,500 policymakers and stakeholders came together in a collaborative process to develop a long-term strategic action plan for protecting and restoring the environmental health of the Great Lakes. I was proud to participate in that process as the congressional representative, and I have a bill in process which will make the collaborative's recommendations come into law.

The discharge of harmful pollutants that is proposed by BP and permitted by the State of Indiana is totally inconsistent with the goals of Great Lakes restoration. Ammonia and TSS, suspended solids, promote algae blooms that can suffocate fish, destroy fish habitat, deprive plants of sunlight and oxygen, and trigger beach closings. We cannot allow for more of these kinds of problems in the lake.

For these reasons, Madam Speaker, I would urge both the EPA and the State of Indiana to take a second look at this permit and find a better means of disposal. I also urge BP to look at other means of disposal. Certainly if they can afford to pipe crude oil from Canada thousands of miles through pipelines, they certainly should be able to find a better solution for disposal of wastes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the resolution.

Ever since the author Rachel Carson ushered in the advent of environmental awareness with her book "The Silent Spring," Americans have understood that we owe it to future generations to be good stewards of the planet and the environment. As in the case with every problem, we should work toward a solution not by asking how little must be done, but rather by asking what is the right thing to do?

As the chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, I feel I have a unique perspective on the issues contained in this resolution.

□ 1045

As chairman of the Energy Subcommittee on Appropriations, I respect BP's foresight. Their investment of a half billion dollars, in collaboration with the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana to increase energy production through renewable biofuels is a worthwhile goal. These fuels have the potential to increase our domestic

fuel capabilities and strengthen our national security by reducing our dependency on foreign oil.

As chairman of the Water Subcommittee on Appropriations, I also fully appreciate the treasure that is the Great Lakes system, including the potable, clean fresh drinking water, and its venues for recreation and refreshment. I also appreciate that the Federal Government has made a commitment to the Great Lakes States over several generations to improve water quality and reduce pollution.

It is my hope that, while it appears BP has the legal authority to potentially increase discharged materials into Lake Michigan, they will act responsibly, refrain from doing so, and reconsider their permit.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 187.

Madam Speaker, throughout my career as a public servant, a principal advocacy of mine has always been to improve the quality of our precious Great Lakes, our magnificent Great Lakes, which are actually 20 percent of the fresh water supply of the entire planet. That is one-fifth of all of the fresh water in the entire world.

We have seen efforts at the local and State and Federal levels to prevent industrial pollution, to stop water diversion, to eliminate sewage discharges and to fight invasive species so that future generations can enjoy the beauty of our magnificent Great Lakes.

In fact, this House has passed many important bills that have helped make those goals a reality. And though we have made tremendous progress, there are still so many challenges facing the Great Lakes. We need to continue to fight to protect the Great Lakes.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, it seems not everyone shares this vision. As has been discussed, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management recently issued a wastewater permit to a British Petroleum refinery on the coast of Lake Michigan which will actually allow BP to increase the amount of ammonia and total suspended solids discharged into Lake Michigan. This is crazy. This is nuts.

This permit flies in the face of everything that we in this body, and numerous individuals in groups outside of this body, have attempted to achieve. Instead of increasing our efforts in creating more stringent regulations, this permit marks a huge step backwards in our efforts to keep our Great Lakes clean.

And although BP might argue that they have followed the law in this process to secure their permit, I would say it does not make their actions right.

The resolution before us expresses Congress's disapproval of this permit and urges the EPA to reject increased



dumping of chemicals and pollutants into our Great Lakes. This Congress must speak up for the Great Lakes. We owe it to our children, to our grandchildren, and for every generation that will follow. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and in support of protecting one of America's most critical natural treasures, the Great Lakes. I thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. EHLERS for their work on this issue in helping to protect the lakes.

Through Federal regulations and State and local cooperation, we have made great strides in cleaning up the Great Lakes. Right now we cannot step back. I am deeply troubled by BP's plan to significantly increase their dumping of ammonia and other pollutants into Lake Michigan. All of these pollutants can cause harm to the environment and to public health. Over 40 million people in the Chicago area get their drinking water from Lake Michigan, and it is critical to tourism, recreation and the fishing industry. We should not be doing less to protect the Great Lakes. We should be doing more, such as passing legislation I introduced with MARK KIRK to stop municipalities from dumping waste into the lakes.

While it is good to increase our national energy security and to create new jobs, this cannot come at the expense of public health and the quality of our environment. That is why BP must do everything possible to limit pollution emissions into Lake Michigan. BP talks the talk about protecting the environment. It is time for BP to walk the walk and protect the lake. The step forward today is to pass this resolution and send BP this message.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, this issue extends throughout the entire United States in terms of its concern, and I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) as someone who lives very near this particular facility.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman and I want to thank Congressman EMANUEL and Congressman EHLERS for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Ten days ago, Michael Hawthorne of the Chicago Tribune broke the story that British Petroleum planned to increase its dumping into the source of our drinking water, Lake Michigan. It was a stunning mistake. BP, a pretend friend of the environment, should have not done this.

Tony Hayward, BP's chief, claims he is "Beyond Petroleum" when he plans to actually become a "Bad Polluter."

Governor Daniels of Indiana also made a big mistake. His State EPA failed in their duty to protect the public and authorized the first new dumping in the lake in a decade. Now 19 Republicans and Democrats joined with

Congressman LIPINSKI and me calling on the U.S. EPA to pull this permit; and 2,700 of my constituents signed the petition condemning BP's plan to increase its dumping in the lake.

Congressman LIPINSKI and I authored bipartisan legislation moving us to a time in which all dumping in the Great Lakes ends. Twenty-four billion gallons of raw sewage are dumped into the lake each year, and 12 billion gallons of raw sewage are dumped in the Great Lakes by the city of Detroit alone. But that is current dumping which should definitely end. We cannot allow new dumping by BP.

Later today we will meet with the head of BP North America, and given the legislative tsunami we are preparing, we should simply be discussing BP's terms of surrender on their lake-dumping plan. BP, millions spent in the "Beyond Petroleum" campaign, but we know it stands for "Bad Polluter." Hopefully, BP will back down and be a better partner in protecting Lake Michigan.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Let me just give you a few numbers here: 30 million, that's the number of people who depend on the Great Lakes for our drinking water; 20 percent, that's the percent of fresh surface water on the entire planet that is represented by the Great Lakes; \$6 billion, that's the amount of money that BP earned in the last quarter. BP is one of the most profitable companies on the entire planet, and a company that has spent a considerable amount of money promoting its green image.

I want to quote to you from a Chicago Tribune Voice of the People article that was written by a BP Whiting Refinery individual, and he talks about, he minimizes the problem. He says: "Of the 23 substances regulated in the permit, ammonia and total suspended solids are the only two limits that will increase when compared to the current permit." No problem, only two out of 23.

And later, consistent with BP's bragging about its environmental excellence says about itself: "This is just one of the ways we have demonstrated our focus on continual improvement in environmental performance. Our commitment to continuous improvement will carry on as we modernize the refinery." Meantime, increasing the amount of ammonia and the amount of total suspended solid waste.

What's the consequence of those emissions? The health consequences can't be understated. Dumping ammonia represents a direct threat to the health of millions of Americans living in the Great Lakes region. For example, ammonia in the water promotes algae blooms that can kill fish and trigger beach closings. So here is another number: 1,585 pounds of ammo-

nia, a 54-percent increase every day, every day into our precious Lake Michigan. And 4,925 pounds of liquid waste consisting of suspended particulate matter, a 35-percent increase every day into Lake Michigan.

In addition to putting our health at risk, the decision to allow BP to increase their dumpage also puts the lake ecosystem in jeopardy. Increasing the amount of liquid waste consisting of suspended particulate matter dumped into the lake each day endangers the marine life by making the water cloudy, thereby making it more difficult for fish to find ample amounts of oxygen.

This is a big deal. This is a serious problem, and it is incredible that the Environmental Protection Agency and BP and the State of Indiana would allow it. It is an outrage. We can stop it.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another member of the Fighting Illini, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, when you come here and represent the Great Lakes and you meet Representatives from all across the country, you meet folks from the east coast and the west coast, you begin having conversations about the water that surrounds their districts. I talk to Californians and people from Oregon and South Carolina, and they are very proud of their coastlines, as they should be. And as a Member who represents a Western district, you try and describe the Great Lakes to them, and it is really difficult to describe. And then you have someone come and visit and they look at Lake Michigan and they look at Lake Superior and Huron and Ontario and Lake Erie, and it takes their breath away because these are beautiful bodies of water.

Lake Michigan is so big and so significant that my almost entire congressional district gets its drinking water from Lake Michigan. So you can imagine the sense of pause and outrage and deep concern that many of us felt when we heard of this plan that BP had that was approved by the State of Indiana to move forward and dump these pollutants into Lake Michigan.

Madam Speaker, my district counts on the fact that drinking water is going to be as pure and clear as this cup when they open up the tap, and I think it is incumbent upon us on both sides of the aisle to stand today and to say this will not stand.

Madam Speaker, my predecessor, Congressman Hyde, had a great line. He said there is one thing worse than gridlock when it comes to government, and that is the greased chute of decision-making. Our role in Congress today is to stand up and to suggest and demand of the Environmental Protection Agency and demand of the State of Indiana that they rescind this order. With that, I am pleased to support the resolution.



Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY).

□ 1100

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern regarding the Indiana Department of Environmental Management's decision to permit significant increases in allowable discharges of ammonia and total suspended solids into Lake Michigan, and I fully support H. Con. Res. 187.

For communities in my district, and I suspect most Americans, Lake Michigan is a national treasure. Not only does the lake serve as a source of drinking water and natural habitat and recreation, it is one of the greatest reminders of our responsibility to be good stewards of the environment.

One component in our strategy to achieve independence from foreign oil will need to be increased refining capacity here at home. I would like to support this project, but first, BP can do better and must do better. Their corporate image is marketed worldwide as an energy company seriously committed to providing modern energy solutions that value our environment; however, BP's wrong-headed decision here to increase discharges in a lake and in a region trying to overcome decades of environmental neglect will not stand.

I do not believe the health of our environment and the growth of our economy are mutually exclusive goals. My congressional district in Indiana features miles of beautiful Lake Michigan shoreline, Porter County, Michigan City, Long Beach. I note the next speaker, Congressman UPTON, whose district is next to mine, he has beautiful Lake Michigan shoreline and has done a great job protecting that resource, and I know he will do that again today.

The goals of energy independence and protection in the Great Lakes are not mutually exclusive. BP just has to conclude that they have to do this in the right way, and the right way is not to damage Lake Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to a colleague from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I commend the remarks by my colleagues from every State that adjoins Lake Michigan, whether they be from Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and obviously in my State, the great State of Michigan.

My district does about Lake Michigan, and I'm a member of the Great Lakes Caucus, with a long record of protecting our Great Lakes body. The Great Lakes are the world's largest body of fresh water, and our job here is to be good stewards. We know that, and we were stunned by the announcement that was made just a little bit more than a week ago with regard to the new refinery that's being built and expanded in Indiana.

Tremendous efforts have been made in this region to protect the Great Lakes, but we see it in other places around the country, the Chesapeake Bay, and it's a disgrace that the mighty Potomac is in the shape that it is. We don't want the Great Lakes to take a step back. It needs to be improved. The last thing that we need to see is that the Great Lakes take a step back in terms of the protection that we have.

I travel in my district in southwest Michigan to Chicago quite a bit, and I can remember as a young boy going through Gary, Indiana, and some of those places there, and it was awful in terms of the pollution. And to their credit, they've done a much better job.

But I've got to say it's my understanding that for the State of Indiana to issue an exemption to its own State law that prohibits mixing zones is wrong. This will result in a serious setback in the efforts to clean up the Great Lakes, especially at a time when this outdated mixing zone practice is slated to be eliminated altogether, and yet we're seeing an exemption to have it continue. It, in essence, rolls back the clock for sound environmental policy.

Last week I picked up the phone and I called Governor Daniels of Indiana. I told him that we had a hornet's nest in southern Lake Michigan, and that they ought to reexamine exactly what the State of Indiana was allowing. The State of Indiana needs to reexamine this.

We don't want industrial waste to be increased. We don't want raw sewage to be increased. We've had our beaches closed enough. I don't care what side of the lake you live on, no new dumping ought to be the mandate that we impose on every municipality, every State in the Great Lakes. We should not be adding pollution. Instead, we should be subtracting to make sure that this resource stays a treasure for every family, for every community, for generations to come.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 6 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. We have one speaker remaining on our side. I would ask the gentleman to conclude.

Mr. EHLERS. I have one speaker, and then I would like to make some comments again.

Mr. OBERSTAR. So conclude with your two speakers, and then we'll conclude on our side.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I cautiously come to the floor today, but I'm troubled by the process here.

I come from a Great Lakes State, Pennsylvania. We cherish the Great Lakes, but we're passing a resolution

today because of a newspaper article, a column, and we have legislation without any hearings. This is why we don't have refinery capacity in America.

In light of recent attention given to the Indiana Department of Environmental Management's permit to the BP refinery, I would like to provide the facts and clear up misunderstandings, says the Department of Environmental Management in Indiana.

The BP wastewater permit was issued in accordance with State and Federal environmental laws which are protective of human health and environment. The State coordinated with EPA during the permitting process to ensure that the final permit was compliant with the Clean Water Act. On April 5, 2007, EPA issued a letter that they had no objections to the permit being issued pursuant to the Clean Water Act.

There are many inaccuracies in the recent media reports. They have given no exceptions to environmental conditions for this facility. The wastewater treatment permit meets all State laws and regulations that apply to the facility and project. Many of the limits placed in the permit are actually more protective than required by Federal law.

We need to deal with these issues with the facts, not newspaper reports. We can't build refineries in America. We blame the refineries. This happens every time they try.

I'm not for pollution in Lake Erie, but I would like to have had a hearing where Indiana could have had its case heard. We shouldn't be here on the floor debating this with very little knowledge and hysteria.

The future of refining in America, the future of energy availability in America, we must have clean water and clean air, but if we are going to have a political reaction without the hearings, without the information, we shouldn't make these kind of decisions on the floor of the House.

I'm for cleaning up the Great Lakes. I have a bill on the outer continental shelf to produce natural gas that will give \$21 billion to Great Lakes cleanup. That's a bill that will help us get rid of the sludge of the past.

I just wish this wasn't before us without adequate process and hearings so we could understand what's really happened there, where we have a real knowledge of information, because we desperately need the capacity they're talking about.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I will be pleased to offer some comments to close, particularly in view of the previous speaker.

As I said in my earlier comments, I emphasized I was not condemning British Petroleum for their actions; although, I wish they had taken the lead in demonstrating the environmentalism that they often advertise that they have. But I do deplore that the State of

Indiana was willing to give them a permit. I do deplore that the Environmental Protection Agency was willing to give them a permit.

This is contrary to everything that we have been trying to do to clean up the Great Lakes, at huge expense. All over the Great Lakes, communities have tried to clean it up, and my preference would be not only that BP does not add to the load they're putting in the lake, I would prefer that they say, we're going to find a different method, and we're not even going to dump in the lake what we're dumping in now, because they are already dumping a substantial amount in.

The goal here is not to drive BP away. It's not to stop the refinery project. I'd emphasize that over and over. The goal is to make sure that we can maintain the purity and cleanliness of the Great Lakes. And Lake Michigan, of course, drains into three of the other Great Lakes and with a smattering going into Lake Superior. So this is a very important issue.

The gentleman talked a minute ago about drinking water out of the lakes. Forty million Americans draw their water out of the Great Lakes, their drinking water. That is a huge number of people. We are very worried about cleaning up the mercury that already exists in the lake, also the toxaphene and other contaminants, because people are drinking that water, and they are getting ill.

The goal here is not to stop BP. The goal here is to make certain they find an alternative method of disposing of the ammonia and the total suspended solids that they are proposing to dump in the lake, and I would hope they also, while they're doing that, stop dumping what they are dumping, and make sure all the ammonia, all of the total suspended solids get disposed of elsewhere. Perhaps they can use a waste landfill, perhaps something else, but certainly we do not want them to be dumping any additional contaminants into the Great Lakes system.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

We're not here reacting to and debating a newspaper story. The report of the planned dumping of highly toxic, highly residual elements into Lake Michigan has been documented. We will have a hearing in the Subcommittee on Water Resources in due course, but this is an emergency that called out and cried out for immediate action to lay a line down in front of the State of Indiana and British Petroleum to let them know that their proposed indifference, slap in the face, to clean water, this precious resource, will not be tolerated by the American public.

They will go ahead and build their refinery, but on that property, they have plenty of room for appropriate disposal of these wastes. They ought to know, they ought to understand, water is more precious than oil.

The slow flushing action of Lake Michigan, it'll be 300 years before water turns over in that lake. It means that whatever they put in that lake is going to stay there for generations to come. They know that. So does the State of Indiana. Protect that lake.

There are alternatives to dumping every colossal waste that industry can sum up into the lake. There are other alternatives. They have to explore those alternatives.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill pending before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, there's a sad irony on this decision by British Petroleum, and that is, 10 years ago, 1997, when I was working in the White House, we had made a decision and Geolyse standards were negotiated at that point, coming on line just about now. It took all of the States, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, to set standards, as also the other States supported the Great Lakes, about polluting and what was allowed and permissible to pollute on the lakes and what wasn't. And those Geolyse standards that brought everybody together 10 years ago and started this movement to protect our Great Lakes in a way that we had not seen since the Clean Water Act, that negotiation and the product of that negotiation was just coming on line right now.

And just at that moment, we have this decision by British Petroleum, which is the most significant dumping in Lake Michigan and the other Great Lakes and Lake Michigan since basically we started the Clean Water Act and reversing the trend of using the lake as nothing but a dumping ground.

Now, if this can happen in Lake Michigan, it can happen in other Great Lakes, which is why other Members of other delegations have stepped forward, and I want to repeat, all that British Petroleum has to do here is they have the technology to actually take a different course here. It's about the size of a land mass that they have to acquire, and if you look again at Google Map, they have plenty of land, 1,600 acres, to do what's right.

So many decisions we face on the environment are about jobs and the environment. You can both double the size of the refinery, create those 80 jobs, and also preserve our national commitment to the clean water of Lake Michigan and the other Great Lakes. It's not an either/or choice.

And what's so sad about the rush here is that this is a decision that could easily be won, that's a victory for British Petroleum, doubling the

size of their refinery, but not doubling the size of the ammonia that's dumped into Lake Michigan and not increasing the amount of both mercury and other metals that are going to be untreated, dumped into Lake Michigan, and then we're all going to be asked to increase the money to clean up what they could have done in the beginning.

They're spending \$3.8 billion. For a fraction, they could actually not only increase the refinery, but increase the capacity to treat these chemicals, and then we're all going to be asked to increase the money to clean up Lake Michigan with something that never should have happened and hasn't happened for 10 years.

□ 1115

Now, this unusual unity here is because all of us have constituents that don't regard this as a party issue, a partisan issue; they regard it as a commitment. We have had a tremendous increase in the consciousness of folks about the importance of Lake Michigan and the other Great Lakes to the environment.

If this was the Grand Canyon or Yellowstone, there would be no question. Lake Michigan, Ontario, Superior, Erie and all the Great Lakes are the Midwest's national parks. They stand as the largest body of fresh water in North America. Twenty percent of the world's entire fresh water is right there.

It is America's third coast. We would never consider doing this to any other national treasure. BP should not consider it here. They can double the size of the refinery, which is a good thing; they can increase employment by 80 jobs, a good thing; and they can be true to their advertising, "Beyond Petroleum," and being the most green energy company if they decide to take the right actions. We'll help them if they want to do that.

But to act intransigent, like they have, is wrong. We are going to be meeting with the North American executive this afternoon. I know the Illinois delegation is. We are going to meet with them to let them know that they have a choice here to live up to their word.

I want to again thank all of my colleagues for stepping forward and giving a voice to their constituents who are outraged across the area with the decision by British Petroleum to do something no other company has decided to do in the last 10 years and reverse the standards and the progress we have made on the environmental quality of our Lake Michigan and the other Great Lakes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 187, which expresses the sense of Congress regarding the dumping of industrial waste into the Great Lakes. My colleague RAHM EMANUEL has introduced this resolution, as has my colleague from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. EHLERS of Michigan. The resolution has 18 cosponsors from across the Great Lakes region.

It is my understanding that a recent decision by Indiana state regulators will allow the British Petroleum company to dump more ammonia and suspended solids daily into Lake Michigan. Although I do agree that our country needs to work on finding additional materials and sources for energy, and we do need to create jobs to help our economy, I do not believe British Petroleum's plan takes our nation in the right direction. As a society, we need to protect our already endangered waters, for they provide means to run our businesses, fulfill daily chores, and relax.

Improving the state of the Great Lakes is not an antiquated policy goal from the last century; rather, we still fight today to improve these waters. The House Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, which I chair, continues to pursue the problems of invasive species, low water levels, and pollutants entering the Lakes on a regular basis. We do not need to add additional waste to our struggling, yet essential, waters.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution before us. Recently, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management granted BP's Whiting refinery in Indiana broad exceptions under the Clean Water Act. These exemptions will allow BP to increase the amount of discharge of ammonia by 54 percent and its discharge of total suspended solids by 35 percent. This means that an additional 1,584 pounds of ammonia and 4,925 pounds of total suspended solids could be dumped into Lake Michigan.

This is simply unacceptable and I thank my colleagues from Illinois and Michigan for bringing the resolution to the floor with the utmost speed. I am dismayed, Madam Speaker. Dismayed that the State of Indiana issued the permits and further dismayed EPA allowed the State to do so.

Algae blooms, Madam Speaker, are serious business. Algae blooms, which can be caused by ammonia and total suspended solids, overtake native ecosystems by taking nutrients away from the surrounding plant life and also feed harmful bacteria which remove oxygen, killing aquatic life. This leads to poor water quality and beach closings. Instead of taking action to increase algae blooms, we should be taking action to decrease them.

According to BP, the company intends to install a diffuser to create a "mixing zone"—mixing zones are areas where clean water gets mixed with polluted water to further dilute the concentration of pollutants. In 2000, EPA instituted a rule requiring the elimination of existing mixing zones for persistent and bioaccumulative pollution in all the Great Lakes States. The rule required the phase-out of current mixing zones by 2010 and does not allow any new zones to be created. The expansion of the BP facility is not scheduled to be finished until 2011. The exemptions essentially roll back the clock for sound environmental policy.

Madam Speaker, those of us from the region have a unique appreciation for the Great Lakes, as we are quite literally surrounded by them. The lakes are a blessing to us. We owe our tourism industry to the Great Lakes—where people come from around the country to recreate, hunt, fish and relax. The lakes as a transportation system provided Michigan and the surrounding States with the means to turn our region into a manufacturing powerhouse.

At a time when Congress is finally taking a long-overdue look into a broad restoration and conservation plan for the Great Lakes, the State of Indiana is allowing more pollution into the lakes. And EPA—the lead Agency in Great Lakes Regional Collaboration—is allowing it. This, Madam Speaker, is exactly the opposite of what we should be doing. Instead, restoring and protecting the Great Lakes must be a priority.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the resolution and again thank my friends, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Michigan, for bringing it up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 187.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 558 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3074.

□ 1120

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEINER (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 23, 2007, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 67, line 2.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND (RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", the heading "Tenant-Based Rental Assistance", and the heading "Project-Based Rental Assistance", for fiscal

year 2007 and prior years, \$1,300,000,000 is rescinded, to be effected by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development no later than September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That if insufficient funds exist under these headings, the remaining balance may be derived from any other heading under this title: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations 30 days in advance of the rescission of any funds derived from the headings specified above: *Provided further*, That any such balances governed by reallocation provisions under the statute authorizing the program for which the funds were originally appropriated shall be available for the rescission: *Provided further*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be cancelled.

#### PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act"), not otherwise provided for, \$6,479,810,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) Up to \$6,239,122,000 for expiring or terminating section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph.

(2) Not less than \$238,728,000 but not to exceed \$286,230,000 for performance-based contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may also use such amounts for performance-based contract administrators for: interest reduction payments pursuant to section 236(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(a)); rent supplement payments pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); section 236(f)(2) rental assistance payments (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q); project rental assistance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667); and loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667).

(3) \$1,960,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

(4) Amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", or the heading "Housing Certificate Fund" may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts or for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (the "Act") \$2,438,964,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2008 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term "obligate" means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$10,890,000 shall be for carrying out activities under section 9(h) of such Act; up to \$10,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund; and up to \$15,345,000 shall be to support the ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities of the Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC): *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the Act: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$17,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters occurring in fiscal year 2008: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$38,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinators and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437z-6) and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading up to \$8,820,000 is to support the costs of administrative and judicial receiverships.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2008 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), \$4,200,000,000: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 2008 and all fiscal years hereafter, no amounts under this heading in any appropriations Act may be used for payments to public housing agencies for the costs of operation and management of public housing for any year prior to the current year of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS  
OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 26 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

Page 72, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000) (increased by \$20,000,000)".

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amend-

ment with my friends, Ms. BARBARA LEE of California and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, which emphasizes the need for HUD to place a greater priority on the security in our Nation's public housing communities.

Indeed, I applaud the work of Chairman OLVER and Ranking Member KNOLLENBERG, and I am very supportive of their bill.

However, a recent criminal act that occurred in the district that I am privileged to represent demands a response. I won't go into the details because it was a brutal act that was done allegedly by 10 young men in a project referred to, known as Dunbar Village.

Until 2002, there was a program at HUD that funded security and safety in public housing communities. A footnote right here: I recently spoke with the inspector of HUD, who informed me that you cannot have good public housing without good security.

However, in 2001, the Bush administration felt that the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program had a limited impact and did not reflect HUD's core mission. When the drug elimination program was consolidated with the public housing operating fund, a grant of \$168,000 for securities services was cut just from the West Palm Beach Housing Authority, which oversees Dunbar village.

Mr. Chairman, this incident has demonstrated that the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program had a far-reaching impact in reducing all forms of crime in public housing facilities.

Our amendment sends a message to HUD to the tune of \$20 million that the Department has a responsibility and the authority to fund security programs in public housing facilities around this Nation's communities. At this funding level, 10 percent of the \$200 million increase in the account could fund security programs in over 100 public housing communities. These functions include employing security personnel, reimbursing local police for additional security services, making physical changes to improve security, funding community policing accreditation activities, as well as training and equipping voluntary tenant patrols.

HUD should recognize this amendment and the despicable incident, like the one that occurred in my district, and others around this Nation as clear indication that they need to do more to improve the safety in their facilities. Unfortunately, it takes violent acts such as the one that I have discussed for us to open our eyes and for Congress to begin reversing funding trends and program adjustments that have left our communities vulnerable.

This amendment does not place an undue burden on the desperately needed increase in the public housing operating fund. While all of the \$200 million increase could be used for activities prioritized in this amendment, we rise today to call attention to the need for secure public housing.

Once again, I commend Chairman OLVER and Ranking Member KNOLLEN-

BERG for their work on this legislation and including the \$200 million increase in the public housing operating fund. It is our hope that this amendment is a welcome contribution to their work.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to begin demanding that incidents like those experienced by the residents of Dunbar Village never occur again.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I want to thank my colleague from Florida for bringing this issue to light.

Mr. Chairman, all of our public housing and section 8 residents deserve to live in a safe environment. We have done our best to ensure that PHAs have adequate resources to address the security issues.

The gentleman from Florida is correct, that there were public housing Drug Elimination Grants, a separate item in the budgets up until the fiscal year 2001 budget. The last time we had that separate program for Drug Elimination Grants, the appropriation for that was around \$300 million on a nationwide basis for securing, for employing security personnel and employing local police and other additional security services that were necessary.

At that time, in the fiscal year 2001 budget, the Drug Elimination Grants were combined with the operating fund. Since that time, the housing authorities, the public housing authorities have had the authority to use monies that were in the operating fund for the purposes that had been previously done with the direct Drug Elimination Grants.

So we, as my colleague from Florida has pointed out, we no longer have the direct Drug Elimination Grants, but all of the functions of those grants may be funded at the discretion of the individual public housing authorities under the operating funds or under the capital funds. I support the use of either of those funds for the important functions of safety and security for our public housing residents.

I am happy to work with the gentleman in the future on this issue. I thank the gentleman for bringing the issue to the discussion today and thereby highlighting the problem, which is severe in some cases, but the resources, as we have indicated, as he has indicated, and we have already done, have been added.

We have added \$200 million this year above the President's request for the operating fund of the public housing authorities, and that should give them the necessary money to do, where it is needed, as they deem appropriate, as the public housing authorities deem appropriate, the drug elimination activities. I am very pleased that the gentleman has brought the issue to the discussion today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words about why the Drug Elimination Grant Program was eliminated back in 2005.

It was terminated in 2005 after numerous reports and investigations revealed that the program had been greatly abused and that funds were being spent for completely inappropriate activities ranging from picnics to conferences. Further, as a competitive grant program, HUD had difficulty receiving qualified applicants, and much of the funds went unspent. In fact, at the time it was terminated, almost 2 years of funds remained unspent.

Instead, the Congress wisely, rather, increased the formula, the operating subsidy program, that has continued to significantly increase that program each and every year. As my colleague's amendment suggests, every activity funded by the former Drug Elimination Grant program is eligible for funding under the operating subsidy program. I think the chairman mentioned that.

This is a better way to achieve the Members' objectives, since these funds are sent to the PHAs by formula, so no competition or plan is required, and because there is certainty of funding.

Most importantly, it leaves it up to the PHA to determine the priorities of use of those funds.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of the time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1130

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED  
PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

For grants to public housing agencies for demolition, site revitalization, replacement housing, and tenant-based assistance grants to projects as authorized by section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v) \$120,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may use up to \$2,400,000 for technical assistance and contract expertise, to be provided directly or indirectly by grants, contracts or cooperative agreements, including training and cost of necessary travel for participants in such training, by or to officials and employees of the department and of public housing agencies and to residents: *Provided*, That none of such funds shall be used directly or indirectly by granting competitive advantage in awards to settle litigation or pay judgments, unless expressly permitted herein.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I

of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 ("NAHASDA") (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), \$626,965,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act (25 U.S.C. 4152) with the need component based on single-race Census data and with the need component based on multi-race Census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$4,250,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of such Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to \$300,000 for related travel: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$1,980,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA (25 U.S.C. 4191 et seq.): *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a): *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$17,000,000: *Provided further*, That for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$148,500 from amounts in the third proviso, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

For the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program, as authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4221 et seq.), \$8,727,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$299,211 shall be for training and technical assistance activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR.  
WESTMORELAND

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. WESTMORELAND:

Page 74, strike lines 15 through 21.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply eliminate the \$8.7 million for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program. The 2007 level was \$8.7 million, and the President requested \$5.9 million for fiscal year 2008. This would simply eliminate it.

These funds, this Native Hawaiian Housing fund, has been funded since 2002. So far there has been over \$37 million going to the housing fund.

In the 2000 census, the Native Hawaiians, and there was approximately 750,000 Native Hawaiians, lived in homes on the island of Hawaii, the average medial value was \$209,000. The Native Hawaiians that live in Georgia, and there is 2,200 of them by the 2000

census, their median value home was \$111,000.

These grants can only go to Native Hawaiians on the islands of Hawaii. I believe that this is probably unconstitutional in the fact that we are doing a set-aside for a racial group, and so I just wanted to point that out.

It is a great opportunity to save some money. It is a great opportunity to look and make sure that we are all treated equally and that the 14th amendment of our Constitution is kept intact.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program is a small program, a small account that makes a big difference in the lives of Native Hawaiians who happen to reside on Hawaiian homeland.

From 2002 through 2005, when the gentleman's party was in the majority, Congress funded in each of those years an average of \$9.4 million for this program. We held it to \$8.7 million in the 2007 budget, and have frozen it at the same level as the 2007 budget in the recommendation in this budget for the 2008 fiscal year.

So this is not an increase. We are, in fact, holding it steady for a program that has been funded at higher levels earlier when the gentleman's party was in the majority and in substantial majority control of this process.

With the funding in the bill, more than 100 Native Hawaiian families will be provided with the opportunity for home ownership, including counseling, construction, and rental assistance during that process. This is one of the HUD programs. We have programs for Native Alaskans, we have programs for American Indians and so forth that are helpful in providing the hope for home ownership on the part of some of our small minorities in our population. I think it is a goal that we should support, and I strongly support the program and urge a "no" vote on the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. WESTMORELAND to eliminate funding for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program.

The Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant is authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act (NAHASDA). The block grant is used to carry out affordable housing activities for Native Hawaiian families who are eligible to reside on Hawaiian

homelands which were established in trust by the United States in 1921 under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA).

Due to a variety of factors, including long-term leases for purposes outside of the HHCA and the lack of funding for infrastructure, only 8,000 individuals currently hold leases, and approximately 19,000 remain on a waiting list, and many of our elderly, our kapuna, have died waiting for the dream of home ownership.

I submit for printing in the RECORD an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin that introduces these families to us.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 9, 2006.]

**HOMESTEAD AWARDS END LONG WAIT FOR LUCKY FEW—ONE HAWAIIAN HOMESTEAD IS AWARDED TO A WOMAN 57 YEARS AFTER HER FATHER APPLIED.**

(By Alexandre Da Silva with Leila Fujimori)

The line for a homestead was so long for Aloysius Lincoln that he never saw the end of it.

But yesterday, 57 years after the former Honolulu Gas Co. employee applied for a lease, his daughter claimed the lease awarded for the second phase of a Department of Hawaiian Home Lands project in Kapolei.

"Unfortunately, he died two years ago. He was 87," said Frances Segundo, 60, who was a baby when her father signed up for the program. "However, his legacy goes on, because this award is for our ohana, our family."

About 2,000 people showed up yesterday morning at the Neal S. Blaisdell Center Exhibition Hall, where the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands awarded 250 lots in Phase 2 and Phase 3 of in their Kaupē'a project in Kapolei.

The 52-acre subdivision has 326 lots, 76 of which were awarded in November 2005.

Segundo, a clerk at Maui Community College, said her cousin, Naira Martin, would live in the four-bedroom, three-bathroom house with her daughter, but there would always be room for another relative.

"I'm free from the rent, which is going to be over with," said Martin, 56. The \$2,000 she pays each month for rent will now go toward her mortgage. "When the whole family comes from the mainland, Louisiana, they will stay with me. It's a very good feeling."

Gov. Linda Lingle, who was present for yesterday's selection meeting, said the latest awards would help the state's shortage of affordable rentals as new homeowners are able to free up rental homes and apartments.

"Those units now become available for the general public," Lingle said. "It is better for the entire community."

Yesterday's crowd was a fraction of the nearly 20,000 native Hawaiians currently on the homestead waiting list, about half of which are on Oahu, said Lloyd Yonenaka, a spokesman for the Hawaiian Home Lands Department.

Even though more than 1,200 leases have been given out since 2003, the department's waiting list keeps growing, at a pace of about 100 people a month, Yonenaka said.

To qualify, applicants must have at least 50 percent Hawaiian blood and be pre-approved to afford one of the five Kaupē'a models, which range between \$238,600 and \$296,100 in lots averaging 5,000 square feet. The lease rent for the land under their homes is \$1 per year.

The first phase of the Kaupē'a project is expected to be completed by the end of the year, while Phase 2 and Phase 3 should be done in the first and second quarters of 2007, according to the department.

As she signed documents for her new lease yesterday, Vivian Perreira, 71, said she would vacate her Maili home in Waianae—where she lives with husband, Alfred, her son and his two children—sometime next year. Perreira said her youngest son, 47-year-old Prince, a refuse truck driver for Rolloffs Hawaii Inc., had to co-sign her application because her Social Security earnings weren't enough for a loan.

After waiting 48 years for her name to be called, Perreira, now in a wheelchair, will lease a four-bedroom home on a corner lot in Kapolei.

"I signed up when I was 23," she said. "I almost gave up, but I left my name on for so long."

The federal government set up the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in 1921, eventually reserving 200,000 acres statewide to benefit native Hawaiians. But development of land to provide homes has been slow, and many families have been on the waiting list for decades.

Last month the state Supreme Court ruled that 2,700 native Hawaiians can seek monetary damages in a lawsuit against the state for its alleged mismanagement of the Hawaiian Home Lands program.

Not everyone who came yesterday had a happy story to share. Homes went to 250 families, but 750 people qualified for lots, which are awarded on the basis of seniority. People who have qualified and waited the longest are the next in line for a home.

Lee Kogler, 54, who has been researching her genealogy for more than 20 years, had to leave without a lease after arriving at 7 a.m. with her husband, daughter, grandson and two sons.

Kogler turned in her paperwork in 1991. But after marrying and moving to New York, Kogler's application was returned, with the department saying she needed to show the Hawaiian lineage on her father's side. Finally, in 1994, Kogler combed through the bound volumes of records at the state Archives, where she found a Census Bureau report listing her grandmother, Hannah Kaulia, at age 19, living in the house of her father, Samuel, a master carpenter.

Kogler, who is number 7,954 on the wait list for Oahu, said she would never quit trying for a lease.

"It's not a sad day," Kogler said, citing plans by the department to award another 300 lots in Kapolei in October. "I'm still with hope. I've waited a long time for this, and I'm not going to give up."

Aloysius Lincoln first applied for Hawaiian Home Lands in 1949. In 2006, a wait of 57 years, his daughter, Frances Segundo, claimed the lease awarded for the second phase of a Department of Hawaiian Home Lands project on the Island of Oahu. Frances claimed the lease because her father had, unfortunately, passed away 2 years before. Frances herself, now 60 years old, was a baby when her father first signed up for the program. Frances stated that "[her father's] legacy goes on because this award is for our ohana, our family."

That is something I would like this body to remember: That this is not just money we are talking about today. We are talking about the opportunity for families to live the American dream of home ownership, and Native Hawaiian families are among those with the greatest need. A study conducted in 1996 by the Urban Institute, the National Commission on the American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawai-

ian Housing, and the State Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, found that nearly half of Hawaiian households and 67 percent of those on waiting lists for Hawaiian Home Lands experienced housing problems related to affordability, overcrowding, or structural inadequacy. That compares with 44 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives living on tribal lands, and 27 percent of all U.S. households.

In 1992, 49 percent of Hawaiian Home Lands applicants lived in overcrowded conditions compared with 37 percent of all Hawaiian households, and 21 percent of non-Hawaiian households. Twenty-eight percent of Hawaiian households put more than 30 percent of income toward housing compared with 22 percent for non-Hawaiians. The rate of homelessness among Hawaiians at 12.2 households per 1,000 is double that of non-Hawaiians.

In 1982, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State of Hawaii established a Federal-State task force to renew HHCA and the programs carried under that act. The Federal-State task force issued a report in 1983 with specific recommendations, including one that the State and Federal Government should each make contributions of \$29 million per year to accelerate the program.

For the first time in 2000, Federal funding was made available when housing assistance for Native Hawaiians was added to NAHASDA through the Native Hawaiian Block Grant. This amendment follows what I sense is a developing pattern of challenges to programs benefiting Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian people.

The earlier failed challenge to the previously uncontroversial Native Hawaiian Housing Act earlier this year was the first apparent salvo against Native American programs. The attempt to strike funds in the Labor and Education appropriations bill for the Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions, and the Higher Education Act raises the concerns that all programs benefiting Native Americans will be subjected to attack by certain groups.

The same arguments of constitutionality of these programs benefiting Native Americans have been raised and rejected by this body time and again. This is not race-based discrimination. The relationship between the United States and Native Americans is based on a political relationship, as Supreme Court decisions have consistently held.

Like other indigenous peoples, such as Native Americans and Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians have a special trust relationship with the United States. It has been well settled that Congress has clear plenary power to fulfill its obligations to indigenous people who once had sovereign governing entities before the establishment of the United States, and whose lands are currently within the borders of the United States. Like Native



Americans and Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians suffered the loss of their sovereignty and lands to the United States.

I could go on, Mr. Chairman, but for these and many other reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, apparently we are going to have to come to the floor over and over on this. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from the Eighth District of Georgia representing the people in Grantville, who I presume have more courtesy than the gentleman from that district has, could let us know besides the smirk on his face when he intends to come and attack someone else in another district. I don't know how you were raised; I know how I was raised.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind the gentleman to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am confining my remarks to the Chair, because if I was saying it directly to the gentleman, he would know it a lot more physically.

Now, the way I was raised, when you have something to say to somebody, you come and say it to their face. Now, if the gentleman would like to accompany me sometime out to Hawaii, I will introduce him to some of these folks that he is attacking today.

This act was established by the Congress, and every single dollar and every single item associated with that has been set forth by the Congress over time. The President of the United States, Republican or Democrat, including this President, has put these funds in the budget in order to meet the obligations of the contract.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with how the gentleman from the Eighth District of Georgia handles contracts, but we honor them where I come from.

There is 200,000 acres set aside, and the original legislation states as follows, section 1065-569, I commend to the gentleman's attention: "Congress does not extend services to Native Hawaiians because of their race, but because of their unique status as the indigenous people of a once sovereign nation as to whom the United States has established a trust relationship."

The Admissions Act that brought us into the Union as the 50th State says specifically that, with regard to these lands, the Hawaiian Homes Lands, that they are to be administered by the State of Hawaii and the United States "for the betterment of the conditions of Native Hawaiians as defined under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920." And it goes on from there to cite what is involved.

Now, the block grant program provides funds for infrastructure to help Native Hawaiians obtain mortgages on lands set aside for them from Congress. Because of the conditions set out by the Congress, ordinary financing is not available to them. This is why we have to do it. If the gentleman had had the courtesy to sit down for 2 minutes with us, we could have explained what this was about.

A decision has to be made here. Of course we have to come and defend our programs. Everybody does. I am quite content to do that.

□ 1145

But this is the first time ever in my experience, my legislative experience of more than 33 years, that this kind of thing has taken place.

Now, I know you folks over there. I'm looking at friends of mine right here. You would never have, me or Ms. HIRONO would never do this kind of thing to you. If you have a disagreement about it, come and see us. Let's sit down and talk about it. And if you still disagree with what we're doing and why we're doing it, by all means bring it to our attention on the floor. But these kinds of attacks are unworthy of this House. It's unworthy of us to have relationships with one another like this. I don't understand it. I've never experienced it before.

Now, we can do this in 5-minute segments if we want to, but that's not the way to handle this. I appeal to you, if this is going to be a continuing onslaught, let's sit down and talk it over.

This legislation, the Department of Hawaiian Homelands is one of the most effective housing efforts that we have in order to try and meet the conditions that were set forth by the Congress and administered faithfully by the State of Hawaii since our entrance to the Union in 1959.

The House supported reauthorization of this program; 272 Members, including 45 Republicans, voted for it. It is not a partisan issue.

And I'll finish with this, Mr. Chairman. The Republican Governor and the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate in Hawaii, as well as the Democrats, support this program. It is not a partisan issue.

And so I ask, out of courtesy for Members, that if we're going to have a discussion about this, at least let's have it on the merits of what the issue is before us. And if we're going to do this kind of thing, at least have the courtesy, the common courtesy that should be extended to any Member of House, to let us know that it's happening so perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we could resolve the issue beforehand.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I missed in the rule book where you needed to call any Member or anything to discuss an amendment that you might have, and I apologize for not reading that chapter in the rule book.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think I was raised very appropriately from a family that had to watch their money. My father worked two jobs. He was an Atlanta firefighter, and he worked shifts. In one week he'd be gone, work at the fire department during the day and then he'd be home at night. And then the next week he worked surveying during the day and the fire station at night, so we didn't see him for a week at a time. And he would watch every dollar that he had, and I think he did a great job in raising me and my sister and providing for our family.

He never really asked for anything from the government, and so I guess that I'm very careful about some of the ways that we spend our money, and especially when it is on a program that I look at as a set-aside program. And whether the gentleman from Hawaii or the lady from Hawaii look at it as a set-aside or not, I don't know. That's their right. And I understand that they may know some things that I don't know. And I can just look at this as a Member of Congress and look at see what the Congresses have done in the past.

And for some reason, Mr. Chairman, the tendency for the majority party now is to tell me and other Members that stand up here and try to look after the taxpayers' dollars what the Republicans did. I don't care what the Republicans did. What they did, what other people did in the past doesn't make what we're doing today right or wrong.

And so all I'm doing is bringing up the point that this is a set-aside for somebody, for a group of people that are not Native Americans. They're not an Indian tribe. This is a race group, and that's as simple as it is.

Now, we can argue all the points that we want to argue, and the learned gentleman from Hawaii is a very smart guy. I know he's probably a doctor in sociology. And he can come down here and talk negatively about me if he wants to. That's his prerogative.

But I was asking a learned defense attorney one day, I said, you know, what does it feel like to have a client that you're trying to defend, and all the information and the facts are against you?

He said, you know what, you just have to really get up and talk as loud as you can and really be as mad as you can and really talk about anything other than the facts. And I know I've seen that on a couple of occasions here from different people.

And so all I'm asking is that we have a chance, in this House, to vote on this amendment. And I think it's fair that we vote on this amendment; that we vote on this amendment to try to decide if we want to give another \$8.7 million, and regardless of what they've



gotten from the Republican Congress since 2002, that we could start anew. And so I think it's worthwhile that we can offer an amendment that we can have a vote on trying to take a special set-aside for a racial group to have something different than the rest of the people in this country have.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. First off, I've been listening to this debate, and I felt, candidly, that it was getting a little personal and I'm uncomfortable with that. But I'm also now uncomfortable with what was described.

I believe, and I want to be on record, since I was on this floor, that Eskimos and Native Hawaiians are a group of people no different from American Indians. They were there before we got there. And that's the way I view it.

And I think that we need to look at how we provide funding for all Native Americans, Native Eskimos, and Native Hawaiians. But I don't see their difference. I see them all collectively the same.

I oppose this amendment. I will be voting against it. But I certainly understand the right of my colleague from Georgia to introduce an amendment. And I certainly agree, though, that it should be opposed.

I yield back.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND  
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), \$7,450,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to \$367,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$247,500 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE  
FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184A of the Housing and

Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13b), \$1,044,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$41,504,255.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$34,650 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH  
AIDS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), \$300,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts and activities authorized under this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may use up to \$1,485,000 of the funds under this heading for training, oversight, and technical assistance activities; and \$1,485,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

For the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, \$16,830,000, to remain available until expended, which amount shall be competitively awarded by September 1, 2008, to Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State community and/or economic development agencies, local rural nonprofits, and community development corporations to support innovative housing and economic development activities in rural areas.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, \$4,180,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the amount provided, \$3,929,300,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (the "Act") (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading (except for planning grants provided in the second paragraph and amounts made available under the third paragraph), not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That \$1,584,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That \$62,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 205 of this Act), up to \$3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety.

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$160,000,000 shall be available for

grants for the Economic Development Initiative to finance a variety of targeted economic investments: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used for program operations: *Provided further*, That, for fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008, no unobligated funds for EDI grants may be used for any purpose except acquisition, planning, design, purchase of equipment, revitalization, redevelopment or construction.

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$20,000,000 shall be available for neighborhood initiatives that are utilized to improve the conditions of distressed and blighted areas and neighborhoods, to stimulate investment, economic diversification, and community revitalization in areas with population outmigration or a stagnating or declining economic base, or to determine whether housing benefits can be integrated more effectively with welfare reform initiatives.

The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of division I of Public Law 108-447 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 194 by striking "for costs associated with replacing the roof on the historic Luckey, Platt Building" and inserting "for building stabilization measures at the historic Hoffman House".

The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under this heading in title III of division A of Public Law 109-115 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 846 by striking "Mahanoy City, Pennsylvania for improvements to West Market Street" and inserting "Mahanoy City, Pennsylvania for improvements to Centre Street".

The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under this heading in title III of division A of Public Law 109-115 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 250 by striking "for renovation and construction of a resource center" and inserting "for construction of a homeless shelter".

The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under this heading in title III of division A of Public Law 109-115 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 713 by striking "for construction of a senior center" and inserting "renovation and expansion of facilities".

The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under this heading in title III of division A of Public Law 109-115 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 844 by striking "Liverpool Township" and inserting "Liverpool Borough".

The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of division I of Public Law 108-447 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 36 by striking "respite care facility" and inserting "rehabilitative care facility for the developmentally disabled".

The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of division I of Public Law 108-447 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 608 by striking "construct" and inserting "purchase and make improvements to facilities for".

The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of division I of Public Law 108-447 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 521 by striking "Missouri" and inserting "Metropolitan Statistical Area".

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. CORRINE  
BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

Page 80, after line 22, insert the following: The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of Public Law 107-73 is deemed to be amended with respect to the item relating to the City of Maitland, Florida, by striking "for a senior citizens center" and inserting "for the Minihaha Park development".

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply reprograms funds for a project that was included in the 2002 VA-HUD appropriation bill to another project in the same city.

The city of Maitland, Florida, which is located in the southern portion of my district, had money allocated to them for the construction of a community center. Unfortunately, the project was completed before funds were distributed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and they are now unable to use this money.

The city of Maitland, the recipient of the funds, has requested that the funds be redirected to another EDI project that involves the redevelopment of a public park that includes the creation of age-specific exercise courses and walking and bike paths.

The money promised to Maitland is still available at the Department of Housing and Urban Development and will have no financial impact on this year's bill. The community center is fully completed, making funds earmarked for this project useless to the city.

Every Member knows this type of Federal funding is crucial to a small city like Maitland, and I would hate to see funds meant for my district go unspent because we could not, HUD, get their act together and make this change.

I would ask the chairman to work with me as this bill moves forward to try to help the city of Maitland solve this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to withdraw this amendment, but I'm hoping that as we move forward, you will work to help rectify this problem that was created by the Department of HUD and this administration.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. I would be very pleased if you would withdraw this, and then I will work with you as best we can to try to resolve this problem in an expeditious and favorable way, if it is at all possible to do as we go forward in this process.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES  
PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$2,970,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$137,500,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in section 108(k) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$743,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

For competitive economic development grants, as authorized by section 108(q) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308(q)), for Brownfields redevelopment projects, \$9,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

□ 1200

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Page 81, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 97, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment today to increase the brownfields program funded at HUD by \$1 million. This funding will be taken from the Department's general salaries and expenses.

I believe the brownfields program is one of the most successful programs the Federal Government has to help revitalize urban areas. These sites, typically in the heart of urban areas, lie idle because no one wants to incur the large costs associated with Superfund cleanups and the uncertainty of whether, in fact, it is a Superfund. As a result, cities are marked by abandoned buildings and vacant lots while developers construct new buildings on what was previously open space in the suburbs.

Though small, these grants serve as seed money, enabling dozens of communities to leverage millions of State and private dollars to move into the actual cleanup phase. This funding should encourage more environmental cleanup and bring about economic development of brownfield sites. By reusing brownfield sites, we are not only rebuilding blighted communities, but also targeting development in city centers and avoiding unnecessary urbanization on fringes of metropolitan areas.

Mr. Chairman, a brownfield is an abandoned, idle, or unused property where expansion of redevelopment is

complicated by the presence or potential presence of contaminations. Brownfields redevelopment can benefit both private investors and the communities in which they are located. For the private sector, brownfields redevelopment can mean new business opportunities, the potential for profit on unused or underutilized properties, improve community environmental stewardship, and access to untapped urban markets.

The retail purchasing power of a central-city resident is conservatively estimated at \$665 billion. Even households in those economically distressed urban neighborhoods possess \$85 billion in annual retail purchasing power. Brownfields redevelopment is critical to tapping into these consumer markets.

Cities encounter many impediments to developing brownfields: the lack of necessary funding for cleanup, concerns over liability, the need for environmental assessments of properties, uncertainty over cleanup standards, unfavorable neighborhood and market conditions, land assembly issues, reluctance to invest in distressed communities due to concerns with urban social and economic conditions.

The bottom line for me is the most successful program that we have encountered in this Congress to deal with urban areas is the brownfields program. Whether it comes from EPA or whether it comes from HUD, we need to do everything we can, in my judgment, to clean up these sites and make them productive, and thereby in the end saving our greenfield sites that should stay undeveloped.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the gentleman will withdraw his amendment here, and I would be happy to work with him because in substantial measure I support the intent of the amendment, but I have concerns about the offset, even though it is a relatively small offset. But I do want to use this time to point out what has happened here on the brownfields program.

The President, in the 2007 budget process, ended up recommending that we zero out this program in the 2007 budget, and he actually recommended rescinding the 2006 moneys, which were exactly the same amount of money that has been put in the 2007 finally and had been put in the 2006 budget. And under those circumstances, when they are making recommendations to rescind, their approach is not to give out any grants under the program until after the budget process for the following year is complete, and, therefore, those moneys just don't get put out until very late. There is a real big gap in it. That is what has happened previously.

This year the President did not propose to rescind the 2007 budget moneys for the simple reason that the 2007 budget moneys were not settled in this until the CR was adopted after the budget was submitted. If that had been done prior to when the budget was submitted, my guess is that the President would have proposed rescinding the 2007 moneys as well as zeroing out the 2008 moneys, which is what has happened in his recommendations for this year's bill.

So we are in this game, in a situation where the people over at OMB believe, I believe wrongly, but they seem to insist that there is someplace else in the budget, namely under EPA, where brownfields redevelopment is going to get done. That doesn't happen. The moneys that are in for brownfields under EPA are for assessments, and we have been doing assessments, and I believe that this should be funded. So in the face of what I have described, we have for the last couple of years continued to appropriate, but at the constant value of \$9.9 million for this program, to keep it there until such time as we have someone who understands that that kind of program isn't being done anywhere else and is willing to move the moneys along, which the administration, as I have described, simply is not willing to do. So that is the situation that we are in.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I won't ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment, which may amount to the same thing as withdrawing this amendment, but could I have a dialogue with this gentleman?

Mr. OLVER. I have yielded.

Mr. SHAYS. What I am hearing is that you are not saying that these dollars are now going to be in EPA. You are saying basically what is in EPA are for assessments, but not to help developers come in and start to clean up. And what I am hearing you say is that these dollars, therefore, are just being maintained at a constant amount, and that this administration is choosing not to allocate them and spend them.

Is that what I am hearing from you?

Mr. OLVER. I am saying that they finally put the grant proposals out for award, but a year late essentially, and each time only after it is clear, for instance, the 2007 moneys will finally be sent out for grant announcements at the very end of this fiscal year when it is clear that we have not rescinded the 2007 moneys.

Mr. SHAYS. Could I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. OLVER. Yes.

Mr. SHAYS. The \$10 million that is in here, which is a smaller amount than the 25 million that used to be there a few years ago, it will be available if we can convince the Secretary of HUD to allocate these dollars to communities; is that correct?

Mr. OLVER. Repeat it, please.

Mr. SHAYS. There is money for brownfields in this legislation. I am just adding 10 percent more. But let's take my amendment out of the equation and at least have this dialogue about brownfields for my edification and for the RECORD. Is it your point that you are appropriating this \$10 million in this budget that you have, but that you do not anticipate it will be spent?

Mr. OLVER. It will not be spent probably until the very end of the 2008 fiscal year, is when finally the RFPs will go out for possible granting.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(On request of Mr. SHAYS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OLVER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, could I just ask is there any legal impediment if we in Congress are able to convince HUD to spend the money? This is not a trick question. This is an edification question. Is there any legal impediment to the administration's spending the \$10 million that you have allocated?

Mr. OLVER. No, there is none. There is none. But the offset that the gentleman has used is salaries and expenses, salaries and expenses is an account which, in the tightness of this budget, in trying to do for section 8 and CDBG and the other places, we have already cut a bit, not a great deal, but a bit, and I oppose, as I said before, in good conscience, the movement of salaries and expense moneys into this where we know that it is not going to be spent with any alacrity and any expedition.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.), \$1,757,250,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, of which \$990,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided*, That up to \$9,900,000 shall be available for technical assistance: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided in this paragraph, up to \$41,580,000 shall be available for housing counseling under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701x).

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. TURNER:

Page 82, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,760,000)".

Page 82, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,760,000)".

Page 100, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,760,000)".

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, coauthored by Representative BIGGETT of Illinois and Mr. GILLMOR of Ohio, seeks to help families who are potential victims of lending practices that could lead to foreclosure. The amendment increases the amount of funds available for housing counseling under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

The amendment would increase the program's funding by \$6.7 million. The increase is offset by reducing the Office of Inspector General account by \$6.7 million. The CBO has scored this amendment as budget-neutral.

Funding for housing counseling has increased by only \$2 million since fiscal year 2003.

Mr. Chairman, as a former mayor of the city of Dayton, Ohio, I have seen directly the detrimental impact that predatory lending and the practice of unwarranted subprime loans have had on urban families and communities. In 2001, the University of Dayton released a study of how mortgage foreclosures were affecting urban areas in Ohio. My community of Dayton had 1 foreclosure for every 43 households. Similar findings were seen in Cleveland, Akron, Columbus, and Cincinnati.

The problem of home foreclosures isn't limited to Ohio and the Midwest. According to a June 12, 2007, Bloomberg article, national home foreclosure rates in May soared 90 percent from last year. Many of these are tied to the subprime loan industry.

Many foreclosed homes sit vacant and boarded up for long periods of time. These properties go beyond just being an eyesore and become a threat to public health and safety. These properties are a blight to our neighborhoods and result in falling property values and increased crime, lead to an eroded tax base, and impair a city's ability to provide important services to families.

Beyond the individual impact these practices have on our neighborhoods, the subprime foreclosure crisis is resulting in the loss of capital in the financial market, a market that, if not righted, could threaten our growing robust economy.

Today we are seeing headlines from all across the country showing the growing concerns of financial markets regarding predatory and subprime lending practices that have resulted in a record number of foreclosures.

Recently, members of the Ohio delegation, led by Representatives GILLMOR, PRYCE, LATOURETTE, and Senator BROWN, held a forum on the predatory lending crisis in Ohio. At this forum we heard from a variety of groups, from banks to fair housing groups. All of these groups shared a mutual concern over the issue of

predatory and subprime lending, and many agreed that an increased focus on housing counseling was a key component to fighting this problem.

It is my hope that increased funding possible through this amendment will allow housing counseling agencies the ability to provide vital counseling services to families in need. These services will give families the assistance they need to protect themselves from practices and circumstances that could lead to foreclosure.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that homeownership is a privilege that everyone should enjoy. We must give all American families the tools they need to be successful homeowners.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if he would withdraw his amendment, and I would be happy to work with him, as I am sure the ranking member would as well, though I would lead him to comment, to work with him in conference to address this issue.

□ 1215

Otherwise, I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I believe the need, as he has indicated, for housing counseling is strong. But what his offset does in this instance is to take the funding for the Inspector General for HUD back to the level of the budget request for the year 2007, where we had increased in the supplemental budget the appropriation for the IG to \$88.2 million, in the supplemental budget had been added to the IG to do its work, and have recommended in this bill a less than 2 percent increase. So that, compared with the 2007 appropriation for the IG, the amendment would represent a 5 or 6 percent decrease in the amount of funding available for the IG.

We simply are not in a position to be able to increase this account because of the deep holes that the President handed to us in the HUD budget. We froze the account at the FY07 level, with the supplemental amount there, which is the best that we could do without harming other HUD programs.

Now, taking the funding from the Inspector General to increase this account is counterproductive to the gentleman's amendment. Should we reduce the oversight in order to increase the housing counseling? They're both vital programs. We feel that we have struck the correct balance here for this pair of needs.

I commend the gentleman's passion on the issue, and I would be happy to work with him in the future on the issue related to housing counseling. And I do recognize that we are likely to have some, in the secondary lending market, problems later this year, con-

tinuing problems, as we have been having, but I would urge the gentleman to withdraw the amendment at this time and we would try to work it out in conference.

Mr. TURNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your commitment to look to work on this issue; however, the housing crisis is enormous. It is impacting a number of families and neighborhoods throughout the country. We're seeing the impacts are grave.

I would like to work with you on where, perhaps, an offset would be acceptable. But at this time we would like the House to be on record in support of this increased funding, so I would desire not to withdraw the amendment. But I appreciate your support of the increased funding and will look forward to working with you.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Turner-Biggert-Gillmor amendment to increase funding for HUD-approved housing counseling services by \$6.76 million, bringing the HUD total housing counseling budget to \$48.34 million for fiscal year 2008.

As the ranking member of the Financial Services Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee, I want to thank my colleagues from Ohio for their work on this amendment, which is a modest increase in funding that could prevent millions of Americans from losing their homes.

I've spent many an hour this year listening to witness after witness testify before our subcommittee and the Financial Services Committee about the current home foreclosure spike. According to data released by the Mortgage Bankers Association, while our country will continue to enjoy record homeownership rates, foreclosures are on the rise and we should expect another 1 million Americans to lose their homes this year. These mortgage foreclosure rates raise eyebrows and call into question what actions can be taken to help homeowners keep their homes. I would like to emphasize the word "action."

Almost 2 weeks ago this body passed, by a vote of 411-7, House Resolution 526 sponsored by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS). This resolution called on this body to take action to support home ownership and responsible lending. The resolution directed us to increase opportunities for loan counseling. So what can Congress do to meet this directive today? What is it we should be doing right now to ensure that 650,000 homeowners and those who may follow can keep their homes? One

step in the right direction is to support the Turner amendment to increase funding and, therefore, opportunities for housing counseling.

It is crucial to promote financial literacy and educate our youth and adults. This is the most direct way of ensuring that consumers understand the terms of their loans so that they may avoid predatory loans and foreclosure altogether.

I'm pleased that on June 25, NeighborWorks America and the Ad Council launched a national ad campaign aimed at preventing home foreclosures. Homeowners in trouble can try to save their homes by calling a hotline, 888-995-HOPE, a number provided by the Homeownership Preservation Foundation.

In addition, we have about 2,300 HUD-certified housing counseling agencies across the country. Americans should know that they can visit HUD's Web site or call 800-569-4287 to find a HUD-certified counselor in their neighborhood. HUD-certified counselors can give straightforward and free or low-cost advice to potential or existing homeowners about buying a home, refinancing a mortgage or preventing foreclosure.

The Turner amendment is one way that we can enhance the ability of our local HUD-certified housing counselors to help our constituents avoid foreclosure and keep their piece of the American Dream. But I think this amendment is good for the economy, good for American homeowners, and I think it's crucial that we act upon it now, where so many people are in these dire straights.

I know that there are groups that are in support of this, and one that comes to mind that we just received a letter from is Acorn. So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this funding for housing counseling.

I know, Mr. Chairman, you have a view about hoping to see him withdraw, but there is an urgency involved here. This amendment recognizes the harsh realities that in many places across the country families face delinquencies in mortgage payments. And they're on a rapid rise. Michigan is one of those States as well. This modest amendment would add funds to professional counselors to help families keep their homes and perhaps help them avoid high-risk loans to begin with.

The program has been a proven success. Michigan, like Ohio, has been experiencing a rise in delinquent loans. This increase could make a huge difference for so many families who are facing a mortgage crisis.

The Inspector General has received significant increases since Katrina to ensure that it can monitor the use of funds in the reconstruction. Therefore, I do not believe the reduction will in any way impact the IG's ability to do its job, and could greatly improve the lives of many families facing a financial crisis.

I do support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILLMOR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I will enter my statement in the RECORD, and I am going to be very brief.

I rise in support of the amendment. I want to commend the gentleman, Mr. TURNER, for taking leadership on this amendment. He has a record of being very active, when he was mayor of Dayton, trying to deal with the problems of predatory lending. And I want to commend Mrs. BIGGERT for her work on this, as well as her work on financial literacy.

Ohio, unfortunately, has been one of the leaders in foreclosures. And I want to point out one of the things that we found about foreclosures nationally and also in the Midwest, most of those foreclosures have not come as a result of loans by federally regulated banks and savings and loans. They have come from those lenders and mortgage brokers who are not regulated by the Federal Government but by the States, who have not done their job.

I called together a conference, I guess about six weeks ago, of Ohio financial institutions, of regulators, of community groups, to talk about the foreclosure crisis and what effectively could be done. And I was surprised that the consensus that came out of that meeting of all those groups was that the single most important thing you could do would be to provide for housing counseling. And the people who did have counseling had a very low foreclosure rate. And all this bill would do would be to provide a modest increase in counseling. We will get a tremendous benefit and a decrease in foreclosures as a result of it.

I think this amendment presents a choice. You have two agencies, and you have a choice between them. You've got the Inspector General and the Housing Counseling Program. Which one are you going to fund level to last year and which one are you going to increase? And I would say to you, if you look at what's going on in the housing market, it is pretty clear that if there is to be a priority between those two, it ought to be to put more money into counseling so that you can save people and their homes.

I also point out that the Senate has already passed language that goes much further than ours. So I would ask for support of the Turner-Biggert-Gillmor amendment.

Today I rise in strong support of the Turner-Biggert-Gillmor amendment. Not a day goes by that we do not see reports of another facet of the growing turmoil in our housing markets. For far too long, Ohioans and others have been subject to predatory lenders, loose underwriting standards and too few housing counseling opportunities. My colleagues Mr. TURNER, Ms. BIGGERT and many others have explored these issues for years and have worked tirelessly to find solutions to the problem of foreclosure. Mr. TURNER was active in efforts to prevent predatory lending as the mayor of Dayton. My colleague Ranking Member BIGGERT has been a leader in efforts to promote financial literacy. Housing counseling is a critical element to helping Americans stay in their home. During a recent summit I put together on Ohio's foreclosure crisis, regulators, lenders and housing advocates from Ohio alike presented an opinion that a significant number of homeowners were not able to tell you whether they had a fixed-rate or an adjustable-rate mortgage. Today, too many find out the hard way when their loan resets. It is expected that some \$600 billion in subprime loans will reset in the next 18 months and the fallout could be devastating to many of our constituents.

The consensus of all those attending was that the most important single thing we could do to prevent foreclosure was to provide counseling before people actually entered into a mortgage. Housing counseling will not be a silver bullet, nor will it prevent someone currently in the foreclosure process from losing their home. That being said, there is a clear need for additional federal resources in this area and would hope my colleagues will support this small increase.

Legislation I recently introduced with Representatives BACHUS, PRYCE and others would authorize some \$100 million per year in housing counseling, a more than doubling of FY2007 enacted levels. The Senator has proposed a comparable increase. While I hope this stand-alone legislation is quickly adopted by the House, this amendment assures that moving forward, Congress is in favor of additional resources for housing counseling.

I urge my colleagues to accept this modest increase in funding so that our constituents can keep their homes once they realize the American dream of homeownership.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I asked for time simply to have a discussion with Mr. TURNER, if I might, regarding his amendment.

Mr. TURNER, in ancient history I had the privilege of chairing this subcommittee, and during those early years I was very, very concerned with what was happening within the total housing programming, what happens to the money as it flows to communities, et cetera. The focus then was upon section 8 housing. I will never forget my trip to New Orleans to try to see what was happening with money we sent there over a lot of years to the Housing Authority. I met with the Inspector General in the offices of the FBI to dis-

cuss what I had seen and some of my concerns. The FBI guy who was there listening to our conversation was heard to say, Congressman, if you really want to get a handle on this, I would suggest that one of the things that you might do is put enough money into the Inspector General's office so you can have a full-time inspector general here in New Orleans, for this fellow flew in from Houston to talk with you today.

I heard a while ago that there had been added monies to the Inspector General's office since Katrina. I have no idea what that means in terms of the real volume, et cetera, but I do perceive that there is an ongoing problem across the country.

So this discussion, or my reason to talk with you, is I admire very much what you're about. I would hope also, as you go about it, that you work very closely with the chairman and ranking member about finding another source of money. The issue is a very important one, but I'm not certain just how well off the Inspector General is.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TURNER. I certainly appreciate your description of the needs for the Inspector General. And I support, of course, the chairman's description of searching for additional offsets for this in order to find additional monies for housing counseling. And in that, I'm certain that after the amendment passes the House, that there would be a great deal of effort by the chairman in conference to seek, perhaps, an additional offset where the Inspector General amount could be restored.

But as you have heard from so many of the Members that are here, this is an issue that strikes at the very heart of the fabric of our neighborhoods and our families. I have so many families who have come to me to tell me the stories of what they have experienced. There are nonprofit organizations in my community who are every day working with families who have faced this issue of foreclosure, and they want to know that we support the services that are being provided to them and that might be available to them.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, let me say that it is my intention to support the gentleman's amendment. I would urge the chairman to consider doing the same as we search for an offset somewhere else. But in the meantime, the issue is a critical issue. It is spreading across the country like wildfire. We are going to see an awful lot more of this challenge, not less of this. So I appreciate the gentleman's effort.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1230

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEINER, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008**

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 3074 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 558, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY regarding a study to determine staffing needs for air traffic controllers;

An amendment by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas regarding funding for the Fair Housing Initiatives Program;

An amendment by Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, or Mr. TERRY regarding funding for lead hazard reduction grants;

An amendment by Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida regarding an annual study of FHA single-family housing mortgage insurance programs;

An amendment by Mr. GARY MILLER of California regarding the authorization for additional Moving to Work Demonstration agreements;

An amendment by Mr. BLUNT regarding Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards;

An amendment by Mr. CONAWAY regarding use of reductions made through amendment for deficit reduction;

An amendment by Mr. DEFAZIO, or Mr. HUNTER, or Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas prohibiting use of funds for certain cross-border motor carrier demonstration projects;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the National Mule and Packers Museum in Woodlake, California;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Los Angeles Fashion District in Los Angeles, California;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Bel Alton High School Alumni Association Community Development Corporation in Maryland;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Hunting and Fishing Museum of Pennsylvania;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Houston Zoo in Texas;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Walter Clore Wine and Culinary Center in Washington;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Belmont Complex in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission in Wausau, Wisconsin;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Arlington Chamber of Commerce in Texas;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Strand Theatre Performing Arts Center in Plattsburgh, New York;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Huntsville Museum of Art in Alabama;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Friends of Cheat Rails to Trails program;

An amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts or Mr. RANGEL regarding community service requirements;

An amendment by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN limiting funds to implement a preferred alternative for the New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia airspace redesign;

An amendment by Mr. GINGREY limiting funds for certain economic development activities which obtain property through eminent domain;

An amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida regarding TRACON consolidation;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding noise mitigation studies;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding technology for temporary disaster housing;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas prohibiting use of funds to undermine unions and other labor organizations representing workers on federally funded transportation projects;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas prohibiting use of funds to prohibit transportation workers from having necessary communication equipment;

An amendment by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio reducing funds in the bill by 6.3 percent, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds to implement Davis-Bacon requirements;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds to employ workers described in section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds for the Alpine Heritage Preservation in West Virginia;

An amendment by Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Ms. WATERS, or Mr. AL GREEN of Texas prohibiting use of funds to take certain actions on standards for mortgagor's investment in mortgaged properties;

An amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE reducing funds in the bill by 0.5 percent,

which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. PALLONE or Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania regarding waste processing and transferring facilities;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia reducing funds in the bill by 1 percent, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. SESSIONS limiting the use of funds for a certain AMTRAK route;

An amendment by Mr. SHULER regarding use of funds designated for North Shore Road in Swain County, North Carolina;

An amendment by Mr. UPTON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina or Mr. LIPINSKI regarding energy efficient light bulbs;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia limiting FHA funds for the creation of an affordable housing fund;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for parking facilities;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for the Edmunds Center for the Arts in Washington;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds for homeownership assistance for certain individuals;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds for the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the Blairstown Historic Preservation Commission in Blairstown, New Jersey;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the City of Marshall, Texas;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the City of Muncie, Indiana;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the I-25 North of HS 66 project in Colorado;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the State Route 374, from State Route 149 to 77, project in Montgomery County, Tennessee;

An amendment by Mr. WALBERG limiting funds to promulgate regulations based on race, ethnicity or sex;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for museums;

An amendment by Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania limiting funds for tolling on I-80 in Pennsylvania;

An amendment by Mr. HUNTER limiting funds for a U.S.-Mexico freeway;

An amendment by Mr. OBEY regarding earmarks; and

An amendment or amendments by Mr. OLVER regarding funding.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate;



and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 558 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3074.

□ 1240

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEINER (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 82, line 13.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House today, which is at the desk.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 94, line 9, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

#### SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, \$59,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided in this heading \$27,710,000 shall be made available to the Self Help Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 12805 note), of which up to \$990,000 is for technical assistance, and: *Provided further*, That

\$31,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building, for Community Development and affordable Housing for the Local Initiatives Support Corporation and the Enterprise Foundation for activities authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), as in effect immediately before June 12, 1997.

#### HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency shelter grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; the supportive housing program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; the section 8 moderate rehabilitation single room occupancy program as authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; and the shelter plus care program as authorized under subtitle F of title IV of such Act, \$1,560,990,000, of which \$1,540,990,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2010, and of which \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than 30 percent of funds made available, excluding amounts provided for renewals under the shelter plus care program, shall be used for permanent housing: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for services shall be matched by 25 percent in funding by each grantee: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall renew on an annual basis expiring contracts or amendments to contracts funded under the shelter plus care program if the program is determined to be needed under the applicable continuum of care and meets appropriate program requirements and financial standards, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That up to \$8,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That \$2,475,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for Shelter Plus Care renewals in fiscal year 2008.

#### HOUSING PROGRAMS

##### HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

#### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701(g)), and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for supportive services associated with the housing, \$734,580,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, of which up to \$603,900,000 shall be for capital advance and project-based rental assistance awards: *Provided*, That, of the amount provided under this heading, up to \$59,400,000 shall be for

service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects, and of which up to \$24,750,000 shall be for grants under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q-2) for conversion of eligible projects under such section to assisted living or related use and for emergency capital repairs as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$20,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary only for making competitive grants to private nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives for covering costs of architectural and engineering work, site control, and other planning relating to the development of supportive housing for the elderly that is eligible for assistance under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 capital advance projects: *Provided further*, That \$1,980,000 of the total amount made available under this heading shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration.

#### HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For capital advance contracts, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, and for tenant-based rental assistance contracts entered into pursuant to section 811 of such Act, \$236,610,000 to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That \$990,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That, of the amount provided under this heading \$74,745,000 shall be for amendments or renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts entered into prior to fiscal year 2005 (only one amendment authorized for any such contract): *Provided further*, That all tenant-based assistance made available under this heading shall continue to remain available only to persons with disabilities: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive the provisions of section 811 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance and tenant-based assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 Capital Advance Projects.

#### OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

##### RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For amendments to contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)) in State-aided, non-insured rental housing projects, \$27,600,000, to remain available until expended.



RENT SUPPLEMENT  
(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under the heading "Rent Supplement" in Public Law 98-63 for amendments to contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) in State-aided, non-insured rental housing projects, \$27,600,000 is rescinded.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND  
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

From the Rental Housing Assistance Fund, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 2007, and any collections made during fiscal year 2008 and all subsequent fiscal years, shall be transferred to the Flexible Subsidy Fund, as authorized by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to \$16,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2008 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0 and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION  
MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM  
ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2008, commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of \$185,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 2008, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709), shall not exceed \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan program, \$351,450,000, of which not to exceed \$347,490,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses"; and not to exceed \$3,960,000 shall be transferred

to the appropriation for "Office of Inspector General". In addition, for administrative contract expenses, \$77,400,000, of which \$25,550,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund, and of which up to \$5,000,000 shall be for education and outreach of FHA single family loan products: *Provided*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed \$65,500,000,000 on or before April 1, 2008, an additional \$1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$30,000,000.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), including the cost of loan guarantee modifications, as that term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, \$8,712,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That commitments to guarantee loans shall not exceed \$45,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed.

Gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(1), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed \$50,000,000, of which not to exceed \$30,000,000 shall be for bridge financing in connection with the sale of multifamily real properties owned by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and formerly insured under such Act; and of which not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single-family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, \$229,086,000, of which \$209,286,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses"; and of which \$19,800,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Office of Inspector General".

In addition, for administrative contract expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, \$78,111,000, of which \$15,692,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed \$8,426,000,000 on or before April 1, 2008, an additional \$1,980 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments over \$8,426,000,000 (including a pro rata amount for any increment below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$14,400,000.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE  
ASSOCIATION  
GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES  
LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed \$200,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, \$10,700,000, to be derived from the GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed \$10,700,000, shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH  
RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies

relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, \$58,087,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing Initiative: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$22,394,000 is for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That activities for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing Initiative shall be administered by the Office of Policy Development and Research.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY  
FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, \$45,540,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, of which \$20,180,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN  
OF TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

Page 94, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,820,000)".

Page 94, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,820,000)".

Page 99, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,820,000)".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman OBEY, Subcommittee Chairman OLVER, and Ranking Members LEWIS and KNOLLENBERG. I also would like to thank them especially for their leadership.

Mr. Chairman, we understand that budgetary constraints are necessary and that budget challenges are a reality, just as invidious discrimination in housing is a reality. This is why Congress passed the Fair Housing Act of 1968.

The Fair Housing Act prohibits housing discrimination not just on race, color and national origin, but also on religious, sexual status, disability and familial status. However, nearly 40 years after the passage of this act, 4 million fair housing violations occur annually, tens of thousands of complaints are filed, and most violations aren't investigated.

Violations occur in the rental market when qualified renters are denied housing based upon invidious discrimination. Violations occur in the purchase market when qualified buyers are denied loans, pay more for loans, or are steered to the subprime market when they qualify for prime loans.

This is why we need to fund the Fair Housing Initiative Program to the level authorized of \$26 million. The Fair Housing Initiative Program allows for testing. This will allow us to have persons who are equally qualified, perhaps one is disabled and one is not, to go out and seek a loan or a rental property. If the disabled person is denied, and the person that follows who is not disabled receives the loan or the property, then we are gathering the empirical data necessary to show that the discrimination exists.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would add \$5.82 million to the bill to bring it to the \$26 million authorized level.

Mr. Chairman, the need is there, the authorization exists, and the time to act is here. Let us keep the American dream alive for all persons who are qualified. Let's do our part on our watch to prevent invidious discrimination in housing.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman is going to withdraw this amendment. Is that the gentleman's intention?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is. My hope is that the gentleman and I would be able to work together to see if there is some means by which it can be accommodated.

□ 1245

Mr. OLVER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the gentleman for that willingness to withdraw his amendment and for highlighting the issue that we have before us.

We simply could not increase this amount this year because of the budget constraints. The budget proposal here is the same as the 2007 enacted budget and slightly above the budget request by the administration. And the offset, the offset is in a place where there really isn't money to take from the offset to do this.

I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to withdraw the amendment and will be happy to work with him to try to find money in conference.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the chairman, and I look forward to work-

ing with the chairman so that we may seek an accommodation in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL  
LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 4852), \$130,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, of which \$8,712,000 shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative, Operation Lead Elimination Action Plan, or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 3547): *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$48,000,000 shall be made available on a competitive basis for areas with the highest lead paint abatement needs, as identified by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development as having: (1) the highest number of occupied pre-1940 units of rental housing; and (2) a disproportionately high number of documented cases of lead-poisoned children: *Provided further*, That each grantee receiving funds under the previous proviso shall target those privately owned units and multifamily buildings that are occupied by low-income families as defined under section 3(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937: *Provided further*, That not less than 90 percent of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used exclusively for abatement, inspections, risk assessments, temporary relocations and interim control of lead-based hazards as defined by 42 U.S.C. 4851: *Provided further*, That each recipient of funds provided under the first proviso shall make a matching contribution in an amount not less than 25 percent: *Provided further*, That each applicant shall submit a detailed plan and strategy that demonstrates adequate capacity that is acceptable to the Secretary to carry out the proposed use of funds pursuant to a notice of funding availability.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:

Page 95, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 95, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 97, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the

gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to give my thanks to Chairman OLVER and to Mr. KNOLLENBERG for doing a wonderful job on this bill.

I intend to withdraw this amendment, but if I can just take a moment or two to discuss the importance of HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control, I would like to do that.

The funding is crucial in reaching our goal of eliminating childhood lead poisoning nationwide by 2010. The grants provided by HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control allow cities and States to correct serious lead hazard in low-income and high-risk homes.

Make no mistake, Mr. Chairman, this is not just an isolated problem. Lead poisoning affects over 250,000 American children under the age of 5 each and every year. High levels of lead in the blood have been linked to childhood asthma, brain damage, hearing loss, hyperactivity, developmental delays, and in extreme cases, exposure to lead has caused seizures, comas, and even death.

Mr. Chairman, this is simply unacceptable.

In my district alone, over 2,000 children fall victim to lead poisoning every year. Over half of all the homes in Niagara and Erie counties were built before 1950 and are therefore very likely to contain lead. And just in Erie County, 1,000 children have unsafe lead levels in their blood.

The city of Rochester is among the top 10 cities in the United States with the worst lead paint problems. In 2004, 900 children in Monroe County were reported to have high blood lead levels. We have a city ordinance in effect to try to deal with that, but we have not enough money obviously to take action.

The grants are so important. They are targeted to help the most vulnerable of our citizens, children under 5 years of age. But in order to be more effective, they have to have adequate funding. Since the bill before us only funds the Office of Lead Hazard Control at \$130 million, we wanted to put in this amendment.

But I commend the chairman for putting together this thoughtful and solid bill, and I hope we can work together in conference to try to do more.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of clause 18, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. MICA of Florida.

An amendment by Mrs. BACHMANN of Minnesota.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICA:

Page 18, beginning on line 9, strike the colon and all that follows through line 21 and insert a period.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 217, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 691]

AYES—201

Aderholt	Ehlers	Kuhl (NY)
Akin	Emerson	LaHood
Alexander	English (PA)	Lamborn
Bachmann	Everett	Latham
Baker	Fallin	LaTourette
Barrett (SC)	Feeney	Lewis (CA)
Barrow	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)
Bartlett (MD)	Flake	Linder
Barton (TX)	Forbes	LoBiondo
Biggert	Fortenberry	Lucas
Bilbray	Fortuno	Lungren, Daniel
Bilirakis	Fossella	E.
Blackburn	Fox	Mack
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	Manzullo
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	Marchant
Bonner	Gallely	McCarthy (CA)
Bono	Garrett (NJ)	McCaul (TX)
Boozman	Gerlach	McCotter
Boustany	Giffords	McCrery
Boyd (KS)	Gillmor	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Gingrey	McHugh
Brown-Waite,	Gohmert	McIntyre
Ginny	Goode	McKeon
Buchanan	Goodlatte	McMorris
Burgess	Granger	Rodgers
Burton (IN)	Graves	Mica
Buyer	Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)
Calvert	Hastert	Miller (MI)
Camp (MI)	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Campbell (CA)	Hayes	Moore (KS)
Cannon	Heller	Moran (KS)
Cantor	Hensarling	Murphy, Tim
Capito	Herger	Musgrave
Carter	Hobson	Neugebauer
Castle	Hoekstra	Nunes
Chabot	Hulshof	Paul
Coble	Hunter	Peterson (PA)
Conaway	Inglis (SC)	Petri
Crenshaw	Issa	Pickering
Culberson	Jindal	Pitts
Davis (KY)	Johnson (GA)	Platts
Davis, David	Johnson (IL)	Poe
Davis, Lincoln	Johnson, Sam	Porter
Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Price (GA)
Deal (GA)	Jordan	Pryce (OH)
Dent	Keller	Putnam
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (IA)	Radanovich
Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)	Ramstad
Doolittle	Kingston	Regula
Drake	Kirk	Rehberg
Dreier	Kline (MN)	Reichert
Duncan	Knollenberg	Renzi

Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Saxton  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions

Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi

Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

Melancon  
Myrick

Pearce  
Pence

Space  
Young (AK)

□ 1314

Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WATERS, and Messrs. HODES, GUTIERREZ and PERLMUTTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. EVERETT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BACHMANN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BACHMANN:

Page 38, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$106,000,000)”.

Page 83, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$106,000,000)”.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds Members this is a 2-minute vote and will be followed by 2-minute votes. Please remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 308, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 692]

AYES—110

Aderholt	Feeney	Miller (FL)
Akin	Flake	Miller, Gary
Bachmann	Fortuno	Musgrave
Baker	Fox	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Paul
Barrow	Gallely	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Gillmor	Poe
Barton (TX)	Gingrey	Pomeroy
Biggert	Granger	Porter
Bilbray	Graves	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Blunt	Heller	Ramstad
Boehner	Hensarling	Reichert
Bonner	Herger	Renzi
Bono	Hulshof	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Jordan	Sali
Burton (IN)	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Camp (MI)	King (IA)	Sessions
Campbell (CA)	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Cannon	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Carter	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Linder	Souder
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Tancredo
Davis (KY)	E.	Terry
Davis, David	Mack	Thornberry
Davis, Lincoln	Mahoney (FL)	Tiahrt
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Walden (OR)
Doolittle	McCaul (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Drake	McCrery	Westmoreland
Dreier	McHenry	Wilson (NM)
Ellison	McKeon	Wilson (SC)
Ellsworth	McMorris	
Everett	Rodgers	

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus  
Bishop (UT)  
Brown (SC)  
Clarke  
Cole (OK)

Cubin  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Gilchrist  
Higgins

Honda  
Marshall

## NOES—308

Abercrombie	Gillibrand	Moore (KS)	Wasserman	Welch (VT)	Woolsey	Baird	Gonzalez	Mitchell
Ackerman	Gohmert	Moore (WI)	Schultz	Weller	Wu	Baldwin	Goode	Mollohan
Alexander	Gonzalez	Moran (KS)	Waters	Wexler	Wynn	Barrow	Goodlatte	Moore (KS)
Allen	Goode	Moran (VA)	Watson	Whitfield	Yarmuth	Bean	Gordon	Moore (WI)
Altmire	Goodlatte	Murphy (CT)	Watt	Wicker	Young (FL)	Becerra	Green, Al	Moran (KS)
Andrews	Gordon	Murphy, Patrick	Waxman	Wilson (OH)		Berkley	Green, Gene	Moran (VA)
Arcuri	Green, Al	Murphy, Tim	Weiner	Wolf		Berman	Grijalva	Murphy (CT)
Baca	Green, Gene	Murtha				Berry	Gutierrez	Murphy, Patrick
Baird	Grijalva	Nadler	Bachus	Cubin	Myrick	Bishop (GA)	Hall (NY)	Murphy, Tim
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Napolitano	Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Pence	Bishop (NY)	Hare	Murtha
Bean	Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)	Boyd (FL)	Gilchrest	Peterson (MN)	Blumenauer	Harman	Nadler
Becerra	Hare	Norton	Brown (SC)	Higgins	Peterson (PA)	Bordallo	Hastert	Napolitano
Berkley	Harman	Nunes	Cardoza	Honda	Space	Boren	Hastings (FL)	Neal (MA)
Berman	Hastert	Oberstar	Clarke	Marshall	Young (AK)	Boswell	Hayes	Norton
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Obey				Boucher	Herseth Sandlin	Oberstar
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Oliver				Boyd (FL)	Hill	Obey
Bishop (NY)	Herseth Sandlin	Ortiz				Brady (PA)	Hinchey	Oliver
Blumenauer	Hill	Pallone				Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Boozman	Hinchev	Pascrell				Brown, Corrine	Hirono	Pallone
Bordallo	Hinojosa	Pastor				Brown-Waite,	Hobson	Pascrell
Boren	Hirono	Payne				Ginny	Hodes	Pastor
Boswell	Hobson	Perlmutter				Butterfield	Hoekstra	Payne
Boucher	Hodes	Petri				Buyer	Holden	Perlmutter
Boyd (KS)	Hoekstra	Pickering				Calvert	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Brady (PA)	Holden	Pitts				Camp (MI)	Hoolley	Pickering
Braley (IA)	Holt	Platts				Capito	Hoyer	Pitts
Brown, Corrine	Hoolley	Price (NC)				Capps	Hulshof	Platts
Brown-Waite,	Hoyer	Radanovich				Capuano	Hunter	Pomeroy
Ginny	Hunter	Rahall				Cardoza	Inglis (SC)	Porter
Butterfield	Inglis (SC)	Rangel				Carnahan	Inslee	Price (NC)
Buyer	Inslee	Regula				Carney	Israel	Pryce (OH)
Calvert	Israel	Rehberg				Carson	Carney	Putnam
Cantor	Jackson (IL)	Reyes				Carson	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Capito	Jackson-Lee	Reynolds				Castle	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Capps	(TX)	Rodriguez				Castor	(TX)	Regula
Capuano	Jefferson	Rogers (AL)				Chandler	Jefferson	Rehberg
Carnahan	Jindal	Rohrabacher				Christensen	Jindal	Rehberg
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Roskam				Clay	Johnson (GA)	Renzi
Carson	Johnson (IL)	Ross				Cleaver	Johnson (IL)	Reyes
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman				Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Castor	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard				Coble	Jones (NC)	Rodriguez
Chabot	Kagen	Royce				Cohen	Jones (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Chandler	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger				Cole (OK)	Kagen	Rogers (MI)
Christensen	Kaptur	Rush				Conyers	Kanjorski	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)				Coopers	Kaptur	Roskam
Cleaver	Kildee	Salazar				Costa	Kennedy	Ross
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Sánchez, Linda				Costello	Kildee	Rothman
Coble	Kind	T.				Courtney	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	King (NY)	Sánchez, Loretta				Cramer	Kind	Ruppersberger
Cole (OK)	Kingston	Sarbanes				Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rush
Conyers	Kirk	Saxton				Crowley	King (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Klein (FL)	Schakowsky				Cuellar	Kirk	Salazar
Costa	Knollenberg	Schiff				Cummings	Kuellar	Sánchez, Linda
Costello	Kucinich	Schmidt				Davis (AL)	Knollenberg	T.
Courtney	Kuhl (NY)	Schwartz				Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Sánchez, Loretta
Cramer	LaHood	Scott (GA)				Davis (IL)	Kuhl (NY)	Sarbanes
Crenshaw	Lampson	Scott (VA)				Davis (KY)	LaHood	Saxton
Crowley	Langevin	Serrano				Davis, Lincoln	Lampson	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Lantos	Sestak				Davis, Tom	Langevin	Schiff
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Shays				DeFazio	Lantos	Schmidt
Davis (AL)	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter				DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Davis (CA)	Latham	Sherman				Delahunt	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)
Davis (IL)	LaTourette	Shimkus				DeLauro	Latham	Scott (VA)
Davis, Tom	Lee	Shuler				Dent	LaTourette	Serrano
DeFazio	Levin	Shuster				Diaz-Balart, L.	Lee	Sestak
DeGette	Lewis (CA)	Simpson				Diaz-Balart, M.	Levin	Shays
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Sires				Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Shea-Porter
DeLauro	Lipinski	Skelton				Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Dent	LoBiondo	Slaughter				Doggett	Lipinski	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Loeback	Smith (NJ)				Donnelly	LoBiondo	Shuler
Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)				Doyle	Loeback	Shuster
Dingell	Lowey	Snyder				Edwards	Lofgren, Zoe	Simpson
Doggett	Lucas	Solís				Ehlers	Lowey	Sires
Donnelly	Lynch	Spratt				Ellison	Lucas	Skelton
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Stark				Ellsworth	Lynch	Slaughter
Duncan	Manzullo	Stearns				Emanuel	Maloney (FL)	Smith (NE)
Edwards	Markey	Stupak				Emerson	Maloney (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Ehlers	Matheson	Sullivan				Engel	Manzullo	Smith (WA)
Emanuel	Matsui	Sutton				English (PA)	Markey	Snyder
Emerson	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner				Eshoo	Matheson	Solis
Engel	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher				Etheridge	Matsui	Souder
English (PA)	McCotter	Taylor				Faleomavaega	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Eshoo	McDermott	Thompson (CA)				Fallin	McCaul (TX)	Stark
Etheridge	McHugh	Thompson (MS)				Farr	McCollum (MN)	Stearns
Faleomavaega	McIntyre	Tierney				Fattah	McCotter	Stupak
Fallin	McNerney	Turner				Ferguson	McDermott	Sullivan
Farr	McNulty	Udall (CO)				Filner	McGovern	Sutton
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)				Fortenberry	McHugh	Tanner
Ferguson	Meeks (NY)	Upton				Fortuño	McIntyre	Tauscher
Filner	Melancon	Van Hollen				Fossella	McMorris	Taylor
Forbes	Mica	Velázquez				Frank (MA)	Rodgers	Thompson (CA)
Fortenberry	Michaud	Visclosky				Frelinghuysen	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Fossella	Miller (MI)	Walberg				Gallegly	McNulty	Tiahrt
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Walsh (NY)				Garrett (NJ)	Meek (FL)	Tiberi
Frelinghuysen	Miller, George	Walz (MN)				Gerlach	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Garrett (NJ)	Mitchell	Wamp				Giffords	Melancon	Towns
Gerlach	Mollohan					Gillibrand	Michaud	Turner
Giffords						Gillmor	Miller (MI)	Udall (CO)
						Gohmert	Miller (NC)	Udall (NM)
							Miller, George	Upton

## NOT VOTING—18

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN  
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1320

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:  
Page 38, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 41, line 18.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 94, noes 328, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 693]

## AYES—94

Akin	Duncan	Mica
Bachmann	Everett	Miller (FL)
Baker	Feeney	Miller, Gary
Barrett (SC)	Flake	Musgrave
Bartlett (MD)	Forbes	Neugebauer
Barton (TX)	Fox	Nunes
Biggart	Franks (AZ)	Paul
Bilbray	Gingrey	Pearce
Bilirakis	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Blackburn	Graves	Petri
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Poe
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Bonner	Heller	Radanovich
Bono	Hensarling	Ramstad
Boozman	Herger	Reichert
Boustany	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Jordan	Royce
Burgess	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Kingston	Sali
Campbell (CA)	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Lamborn	Sessions
Cantor	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Carter	Linder	Smith (TX)
Chabot	Lungren, Daniel	Tancred
Conaway	E.	Terry
Culberson	Mack	Thornberry
Davis, David	Marchant	Wamp
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Weldon (FL)
Doolittle	McCrery	Westmoreland
Drake	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Dreier	McKeon	

## NOES—328

Abercrombie	Alexander	Andrews
Ackerman	Allen	Arcuri
Aderholt	Altmire	Baca

Van Hollen Waters Wicker  
Velázquez Watson Wilson (NM)  
Visclosky Watt Wilson (OH)  
Walberg Waxman Wolf  
Walden (OR) Weiner Woolsey  
Walsh (NY) Welch (VT) Wu  
Walz (MN) Weller Wynn  
Wasserman Wexler Yarmuth  
Schultz Whitfield Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—14

Bachus Davis, Jo Ann Myrick  
Bishop (UT) Gilchrist Pence  
Brown (SC) Higgins Space  
Clarke Honda Young (AK)  
Cubin Marshall

□ 1325

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 41, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$425,000,000)”.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 104, noes 312, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 694]

## AYES—104

Akin Everett Mica  
Bachmann Feeney Miller (FL)  
Baker Flake Miller, Gary  
Barrett (SC) Forbes Musgrave  
Bartlett (MD) Foxx Neugebauer  
Barton (TX) Franks (AZ) Nunes  
Bilbray Gallegly Paul  
Bilirakis Gingrey Pearce  
Blackburn Granger Peterson (PA)  
Blunt Graves Petri  
Boehner Hall (TX) Poe  
Bonner Hastings (WA) Price (GA)  
Bono Heller Radanovich  
Boozman Hensarling Ramstad  
Boustany Herger Reichert  
Brady (TX) Inglis (SC) Rogers (KY)  
Buchanan Issa Rohrabacher  
Burgess Johnson, Sam Royce  
Burton (IN) Jones (NC) Ryan (WI)  
Buyer Jordan Sali  
Campbell (CA) Keller Sensenbrenner  
Cannon King (IA) Sessions  
Cantor Kingston Shadegg  
Carter Kline (MN) Smith (NE)  
Chabot Lamborn Smith (TX)  
Coble Lewis (KY) Stearns  
Conaway Linder Sullivan  
Culberson Lungren, Daniel Tancredo  
Davis (KY) E. Terry  
Davis, David Mack Thornberry  
Deal (GA) Marchant Tiberti  
Doolittle McCarthy (CA) Wamp  
Drake McCreery Weldon (FL)  
Dreier McHenry Westmoreland  
Duncan McKeon Wilson (SC)

## NOES—312

Ackerman Allen Arcuri  
Aderholt Altmire Baca  
Alexander Andrews Baird

Baldwin Baldwin  
Barrow Barrow  
Bean Hall (NY)  
Becerra Harman  
Berkley Hastert  
Berman Hastings (FL)  
Berry Hayes  
Biggert Herseth Sandlin  
Bishop (GA) Hill  
Bishop (NY) Hinchey  
Blumenauer Hinojosa  
Bordallo Hirono  
Boren Hobson  
Boswell Hodes  
Boucher Hoekstra  
Boyd (FL) Holden  
Boyd (KS) Holt  
Brady (PA) Hooley  
Braley (IA) Hoyer  
Brown, Corrine Hulshof  
Brown-Waite, Hunter  
Ginny Inslee  
Butterfield Israel  
Calvert Jackson (IL)  
Camp (MI) Jackson-Lee  
Capito (TX)  
Capps Jefferson  
Capuano Jindal  
Cardoza Johnson (GA)  
Carnahan Johnson (IL)  
Carney Johnson, E. B.  
Carson Jones (OH)  
Castle Kagen  
Castor Kanjorski  
Chandler Kennedy  
Christensen Kildee  
Clay Kilpatrick  
Clyburn Kind  
Cohen King (NY)  
Cole (OK) Kirk  
Conyers Klein (FL)  
Cooper Knollenberg  
Costa Kucinich  
Costello Kuhl (NY)  
Courtney LaHood  
Cramer Lampson  
Crenshaw Langevin  
Crowley Lantos  
Cuellar Larsen (WA)  
Cummings Larson (CT)  
Davis (AL) Latham  
Davis (CA) LaTourette  
Davis (IL) Lee  
Davis, Lincoln Levin  
Davis, Tom Lewis (CA)  
DeFazio Lewis (GA)  
DeGette Lipinski  
Delahunt LoBlondo  
DeLauro Loebsock  
Dent Lofgren, Zoe  
Diaz-Balart, L. Lowey  
Diaz-Balart, M. Lucas  
Dicks Lynch  
Dingell Mahoney (FL)  
Doggett Maloney (NY)  
Donnelly Manullo  
Doyle Markey  
Edwards Matheson  
Ehlers Matsui  
Ellsworth McCarthy (NY)  
Emanuel McCaul (TX)  
Emerson McCollum (MN)  
Engel McCotter  
English (PA) McDermott  
Eshoo McGovern  
Etheridge McHugh  
Faleomavaega McIntyre  
Fallin McMorris  
Farr Rodgers  
Fattah McNerney  
Ferguson McNulty  
Filner Meek (FL)  
Fortenberry Meeks (NY)  
Fortuño Melancon  
Fossella Michaud  
Frank (MA) Miller (MI)  
Frelinghuysen Miller (NC)  
Garrett (NJ) Miller, George  
Gerlach Mitchell  
Giffords Mollahan  
Gillibrand Moore (KS)  
Gillmor Moore (WI)  
Gohmert Moran (KS)  
Gonzalez Moran (VA)  
Goode Murphy (CT)  
Goodlatte Murphy, Patrick  
Gordon Murphy, Tim  
Green, Al Murtha  
Green, Gene Nadler

Napolitano Napolitano  
Neal (MA) Neal (MA)  
Norton Norton  
Oberstar Oberstar  
Obey Obey  
Oliver Oliver  
Ortiz Ortiz  
Pallone Pallone  
Pascrell Pascrell  
Pastor Pastor  
Payne Payne  
Perlmutter Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN) Peterson (MN)  
Pickering Pickering  
Pitts Pitts  
Platts Platts  
Pomeroy Pomeroy  
Porter Porter  
Price (NC) Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH) Pryce (OH)  
Putnam Putnam  
Rahall Rahall  
Rangel Rangel  
Regula Regula  
Rehberg Rehberg  
Renzi Renzi  
Reyes Reyes  
Reynolds Reynolds  
Rodriguez Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (MI) Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam Roskam  
Ross Ross  
Rothman Rothman  
Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger Ruppersberger  
Rush Rush  
Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)  
Salazar Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda Sánchez, Linda  
T. T.  
Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes Sarbanes  
Saxton Saxton  
Schakowsky Schakowsky  
Schiff Schiff  
Schmidt Schmidt  
Schwartz Schwartz  
Scott (GA) Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA) Scott (VA)  
Serrano Serrano  
Sestak Sestak  
Shays Shays  
Shea-Porter Shea-Porter  
Sherman Sherman  
Shimkus Shimkus  
Shuler Shuler  
Shuster Shuster  
Simpson Simpson  
Sires Sires  
Skelton Skelton  
Slaughter Slaughter  
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA) Smith (WA)  
Snyder Snyder  
Solis Solis  
Souder Souder  
Spratt Spratt  
Stark Stark  
Stupak Stupak  
Sutton Sutton  
Tanner Tanner  
Tauscher Tauscher  
Taylor Taylor  
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)  
Tiahrt Tiahrt  
Tierney Tierney  
Towns Towns  
Turner Turner  
Udall (CO) Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM) Udall (NM)  
Upton Upton  
Van Hollen Van Hollen  
Velázquez Velázquez  
Visclosky Visclosky  
Walberg Walberg  
Walden (OR) Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY) Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN) Walz (MN)  
Wasserman Wasserman  
Schultz Schultz  
Waters Waters  
Watson Watson  
Watt Watt  
Weiner Weiner  
Welch (VT) Welch (VT)  
Weller Weller

Wexler Wexler  
Whitfield Whitfield  
Wicker Wicker  
Wilson (NM) Wilson (NM)

Wilson (OH) Wilson (OH)  
Wolf Wolf  
Woolsey Woolsey  
Wu Wu

Wynn Wynn  
Yarmuth Yarmuth  
Young (FL) Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie Davis, Jo Ann Marshall  
Bachus Ellison Myrick  
Bishop (UT) Gilchrist Pence  
Brown (SC) Hare Space  
Clarke Higgins Waxman  
Cleaver Honda Young (AK)  
Cubin Kaptur

□ 1328

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHABOT:

Page 61, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$330,000,000)”.

Page 61, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$330,000,000)”.

Page 61, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$330,000,000)”.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 121, noes 300, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 695]

## AYES—121

Akin Gingrey Moran (KS)  
Bachmann Gohmert Murphy, Patrick  
Barrett (SC) Goode Musgrave  
Bartlett (MD) Goodlatte Neugebauer  
Barton (TX) Graves Nunes  
Bilbray Hall (TX) Paul  
Blackburn Hastert Pearce  
Boehner Hastings (WA) Peterson (PA)  
Boozman Heller Petri  
Brady (TX) Hensarling Pickering  
Brown-Waite, Herger Pitts  
Ginny Hunter Poe  
Burton (IN) Issa Price (GA)  
Calvert Johnson (IL) Putnam  
Camp (MI) Johnson, Sam Radanovich  
Campbell (CA) Jordan Reynolds  
Cannon Keller Rogers (KY)  
Cantor King (IA) Rogers (MI)  
Chabot King (NY) Rohrabacher  
Coble Kingston Roskam  
Conaway Kirk Royce  
Crenshaw Kline (MN) Ryan (WI)  
Culberson Lamborn Sali  
Davis, David Latham Schmidt  
Davis, Tom Lewis (CA) Schwartz  
Deal (GA) Lewis (KY) Sensenbrenner  
Doolittle Linder Sessions  
Drake Lungren, Daniel Shadegg  
Dreier E. Shuster  
Duncan Mack Smith (NE)  
Everett Manullo Smith (TX)  
Feeney Marchant Stearns  
Flake McCarthy (CA) Sullivan  
Forbes McCaul (TX) Tancredo  
Fossella McHenry Thornberry  
Foxx McKeon Tiahrt  
Franks (AZ) Miller (FL) Walberg  
Gallegly Miller, Gary Wamp  
Garrett (NJ) Miller, Gary Weldon (FL)

Weller  
Westmoreland

Wicker  
Wilson (SC)

Wolf  
Young (FL)

Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson

Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wilson (NM)

Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth

## NOES—300

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Bonner  
Bono  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Castor  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Faleomavaega  
Fallin

Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fortenberry  
Fortuño  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez  
Granger  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jindal  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiberti  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky

## NOT VOTING—15

Bachus  
Bishop (UT)  
Brown (SC)  
Clarke  
Cubin

Davis, Jo Ann  
Gilchrest  
Higgins  
Honda  
Marshall

Myrick  
Pence  
Rangel  
Space  
Young (AK)

□ 1333

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 120, line 5, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

## MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$1,211,379,650, of which \$556,776,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, \$10,700,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association, \$743,000 shall be from the "Community Development Loan Guarantee Program" account, \$148,500 shall be provided by transfer from the "Native American Housing Block Grants" account, \$247,500 shall be provided by transfer from the "Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program" account, and \$34,650 shall be transferred from the "Native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund" account: *Provided*, That no official or employee of the Department shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall establish positive control of and maintain adequate systems of accounting for appropriations and other available funds as required by 31 U.S.C. 1514: *Provided further*, That for purposes of funds control and determining whether a violation exists under the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341 et seq.), the point of obligation shall be the executed agreement or contract, except with respect to insurance and guarantee programs, certain types of salaries and expenses funding, and incremental funding that is authorized under an executed agreement or contract, and shall be designated in the approved funds control plan: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall: (1) appoint qualified personnel to conduct investigations of potential or actual violations; (2) establish minimum training requirements and other qualifications for personnel that may be appointed to conduct investigations;

(3) establish guidelines and timeframes for the conduct and completion of investigations; (4) prescribe the content, format and other requirements for the submission of final reports on violations; and (5) prescribe such additional policies and procedures as may be required for conducting investigations of, and administering, processing, and reporting on, potential and actual violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act and all other statutes and regulations governing the obligation and expenditure of funds made available in this or any other Act: *Provided further*, That up to \$15,000,000 may be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall fill 7 out of 10 vacancies at the GS-14 and GS-15 levels until the total number of GS-14 and GS-15 positions in the Department has been reduced from the number of GS-14 and GS-15 positions on the date of enactment of Public Law 106-377 by 2½ percent.

## WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For additional capital for the Working Capital Fund (42 U.S.C. 3535) for the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related development activities, \$125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated by previously enacted appropriations Acts or from within this Act may be used only for the purposes specified under this Fund, in addition to the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$113,760,000, of which \$23,760,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

## OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE

## OVERSIGHT

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, including not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$66,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Federal Housing Enterprises Oversight Fund: *Provided*, That the Director shall submit a spending plan for the amounts provided under this heading no later than January 15, 2008: *Provided further*, That not less than 80 percent of the total amount made available under this heading shall be used only for examination, supervision, and capital oversight of the enterprises (as such term is defined in section 1303 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4502)) to ensure that the enterprises are operating in a financially safe and sound manner and complying with the capital requirements under subtitle B of such Act: *Provided further*, That not to exceed the amount provided herein shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund: *Provided further*, That the general fund amount shall be reduced as collections are received during

the fiscal year so as to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF  
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2008 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a non-frivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. (a) Notwithstanding section 854(c)(1)(A) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)(1)(A)), from any amounts made available under this title for fiscal year 2008 that are allocated under such section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate and make a grant, in the amount determined under subsection (b), for any State that—

(1) received an allocation in a prior fiscal year under clause (ii) of such section; and

(2) is not otherwise eligible for an allocation for fiscal year 2008 under such clause (ii) because the areas in the State outside of the metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) in fiscal year 2008 do not have the number of cases of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) required under such clause.

(b) The amount of the allocation and grant for any State described in subsection (a) shall be an amount based on the cumulative number of AIDS cases in the areas of that State that are outside of metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) of such section 854(c)(1)(A) in fiscal year 2008, in proportion to AIDS cases among cities and States that qualify under clauses (i) and (ii) of such section and States deemed eligible under subsection (a).

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount allocated for fiscal year 2008 under section 854(c) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)), to the City of New York, New York, on behalf of the New York-Wayne-White Plains, New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Division (hereafter “metropolitan division”) of the New York-Newark-Edison, NY-NJ-PA Metropolitan Statistical Area, shall be adjusted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by: (1) allocating to the City of Jersey City, New Jersey, the proportion of the metropolitan area's or division's amount that is based on the number of cases of AIDS reported in the portion of the metropolitan area or division that is located in Hudson County, New Jersey, and adjusting for the

proportion of the metropolitan division's high incidence bonus if this area in New Jersey also has a higher than average per capita incidence of AIDS; and (2) allocating to the City of Paterson, New Jersey, the proportion of the metropolitan area's or division's amount that is based on the number of cases of AIDS reported in the portion of the metropolitan area or division that is located in Bergen County and Passaic County, New Jersey, and adjusting for the proportion of the metropolitan division's high incidence bonus if this area in New Jersey also has a higher than average per capita incidence of AIDS. The recipient cities shall use amounts allocated under this subsection to carry out eligible activities under section 855 of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12904) in their respective portions of the metropolitan division that is located in New Jersey.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount allocated for fiscal year 2008 under section 854(c) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)) to areas with a higher than average per capita incidence of AIDS, shall be adjusted by the Secretary on the basis of area incidence reported over a three year period.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2008 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. None of the funds provided in this title for technical assistance, training, or

management improvements may be obligated or expended unless the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development provides to the Committees on Appropriations a description of each proposed activity and a detailed budget estimate of the costs associated with each program, project or activity as part of the Budget Justifications. For fiscal year 2008, the Secretary shall transmit this information to the Committees by March 15, 2008 for 30 days of review.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 210. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount allocated for fiscal year 2008 under section 854(c) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)), to the City of Wilmington, Delaware, on behalf of the Wilmington, Delaware-Maryland-New Jersey Metropolitan Division (“metropolitan division”), shall be adjusted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by allocating to the State of New Jersey the proportion of the metropolitan division's amount that is based on the number of cases of AIDS reported in the portion of the metropolitan division that is located in New Jersey, and adjusting for the proportion of the metropolitan division's high incidence bonus if this area in New Jersey also has a higher than average per capita incidence of AIDS. The State of New Jersey shall use amounts allocated to the State under this subsection to carry out eligible activities under section 855 of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12904) in the portion of the metropolitan division that is located in New Jersey.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate to Wake County, North Carolina, the amounts that otherwise would be allocated for fiscal year 2008 under section 854(c) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)) to the City of Raleigh, North Carolina, on behalf of the Raleigh-Cary, North Carolina Metropolitan Statistical Area. Any amounts allocated to Wake County shall be used to carry out eligible activities under section 855 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12904) within such metropolitan statistical area.

(c) Notwithstanding section 854(c) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may adjust the allocation of the amounts that otherwise would be allocated for fiscal year 2008 under section 854(c) of such Act, upon the written request of an applicant, in conjunction with the State(s), for a formula allocation on behalf of a metropolitan statistical area, to designate the State or States in which the metropolitan statistical area is located as the eligible grantee(s) of the allocation. In the case that a metropolitan statistical area involves more than one State, such amounts allocated to each State shall be in proportion to the number of cases of AIDS reported in the portion of the metropolitan statistical area located in that State. Any amounts allocated to a State under this section shall be used to carry out eligible activities within the portion of the metropolitan statistical area located in that State.

SEC. 211. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit an annual report no later than August 30, 2008 and annually thereafter to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding the number of Federally assisted units under



lease and the per unit cost of these units to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 212. The Department of Housing and Urban Development shall submit the Department's fiscal year 2009 congressional budget justifications to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate using the identical structure provided under this Act and only in accordance with the direction specified in the report accompanying this Act.

SEC. 213. Incremental vouchers previously made available under the heading "Housing Certificate Fund" or renewed under the heading, "Tenant-Based Rental Assistance," for non-elderly disabled families shall, to the extent practicable, continue to be provided to non-elderly disabled families upon turnover.

SEC. 214. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance in the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 in the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall establish an advisory board of not less than 6 residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 215. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions listed in subsection (b), for fiscal years 2008 and 2009, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of project-based assistance, debt and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions, associated with one multifamily housing project to another multifamily housing project.

(b) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) the number of low-income and very low-income units and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided by the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project;

(2) the transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically non-viable;

(3) the receiving project shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary;

(4) the owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials;

(5) the tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy;

(6) the Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants;

(7) if either the transferring project or the receiving project meets the condition specified in subsection (c)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary;

(8) if the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (c)(2)(E), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project shall

execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions;

(9) any financial risk to the FHA General and Special Risk Insurance Fund, as determined by the Secretary, would be reduced as a result of a transfer completed under this section; and

(10) the Secretary determines that Federal liability with regard to this project will not be increased.

(c) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms "low-income" and "very low-income" shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term "multifamily housing project" means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(E) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term "project-based assistance" means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act; and,

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959;

(4) the term "receiving project" means the multifamily housing project to which the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required use low-income and very low-income restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term "transferring project" means the multifamily housing project which is transferring the project-based assistance, debt and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project; and,

(6) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 216. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading "Native American Housing Block Grants" in title III of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 217. Incremental vouchers previously made available under the heading, "Housing Certificate Fund" or renewed under the heading, "Tenant-Based Rental Assistance", for family unification shall, to the extent practicable, continue to be provided for family unification.

SEC. 218. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to develop or impose policies or procedures, including an account structure, that subjects the Government National Mortgage Association to the requirements of the Federal Credit Reform Act of

1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.). This section shall not be construed to exempt that entity from credit subsidy budgeting or from budget presentation requirements previously adopted.

SEC. 219. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

(c) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue final regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 220. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(g)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2008, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under section 255 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20).

SEC. 221. The National Housing Act is amended—

(1) in sections 207(c)(3), 213(b)(2)(B)(i), 221(d)(3)(ii)(II), 221(d)(4)(ii)(II), 231(c)(2)(B), and 234(e)(3)(B) (12 U.S.C. 1713(c)(3), 1715e(b)(2)(B)(i), 1715l(d)(3)(ii)(II), 1715l(d)(4)(ii)(II), 1715v(c)(2)(B), and 1715y(e)(3)(B))—

(A) by striking "140 percent" each place such term appears and inserting "170 percent"; and

(B) by striking "170 percent in high cost areas" each place such term appears and inserting "215 percent in high cost areas"; and

(2) in section 220(d)(3)(B)(iii)(III) (12 U.S.C. 1715k(d)(3)(B)(iii)(III)) by striking "206A" and all that follows through "project-by-project basis" and inserting the following: "206A of this Act) by not to exceed 170 percent in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed 170 percent, or 215 percent in high cost areas, where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis".

SEC. 222. (a) During fiscal year 2008, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and (18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any

such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 223. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the recipient of a grant under section 202(b) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q-2) after December 26, 2000, in accordance with the unnumbered paragraph at the end of section 202(b) of such Act, may, at its option, establish a single-asset nonprofit entity to own the project and may lend the grant funds to such entity, which may be a private nonprofit organization described in section 831 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000.

SEC. 224. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall give priority consideration to applications from the housing authorities of the Counties of San Bernardino and Santa Clara and the City of San Jose, California to participate in the Moving to Work Demonstration Agreement under section 204, title V, of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-134, April 26, 1996): *Provided*, That upon turnover, existing requirements on the reissuance of section 8 vouchers shall be maintained to ensure that not less than 75 percent of all vouchers shall be made available to extremely low-income families.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARY G. MILLER  
OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

At the end of title II (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, notwithstanding any other provision of law, approve additional Moving to Work Demonstration Agreements, which are entered into between a public housing agency and the Secretary under section 204 of Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (as contained in section 101(e) of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-134; 42 U.S.C. 1437f note)), but at no time may the number of active Moving to Work Demonstration Agreements exceed 32.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the Moving to Work program has enabled Public Housing Authorities, PHAs, to create jobs for residents, add affordable housing stock, and help families build savings. Such efforts have gained recognition as being very successful in serving more

families and helping recipients to self-sufficiency. The innovation and flexibility of the Moving to Work program helps more families realize self-sufficiency through locally oriented programs instead of HUD's one-size-fits-all approach.

Despite these benefits, only 24 of the more than 3,000 PHAs in the Nation are participating in the Moving to Work program. This amendment merely clarifies existing law in order to eliminate confusion at HUD about the number of PHAs authorized to be designated as Moving to Work. Congress has authorized 32 PHAs to participate in the Moving to Work program. Despite this clear intent to have 32 PHAs be designated as Moving to Work, due to what I view as a misinterpretation at HUD, there are only 24 agencies that are currently allowed to participate in the Moving to Work program. Once PHAs leave the Moving to Work program, HUD has said that no new agencies can be selected to fill their vacancies.

This simple and straightforward amendment would clarify Congress's intent to require HUD to implement Moving to Work at its fully authorized level. The amendment directs the Secretary of HUD to promptly approve new PHAs to participate in the Moving to Work program whenever the number of agencies is less than the total number and level we have authorized at 32. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Does the chairman plan on opposing this amendment?

Mr. OLVER. If the gentleman will yield, I do intend to insist upon the point of order.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Then if the gentleman is going to raise a point of order, I will withdraw the amendment.

May I have a colloquy with the chairman?

Mr. OLVER. I will be happy to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Chairman OLVER, the Moving to Work program has enabled Public Housing Authorities to create jobs for residents, add affordable housing stock, and help families build savings. Such efforts have gained recognition as being very successful and serving more families and helping recipients to self-sufficiency.

Congress has authorized 32 PHAs to participate in the Moving to Work program. Unfortunately, due to the misinterpretation at HUD, there are only 24 PHAs that are allowed to participate in the Moving to Work program.

Mr. Chairman, would you agree that it is the intent of Congress that HUD must implement the Moving to Work program at its fully authorized level?

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman who is offering the amendment and offering to withdraw it, I want to say that I am a supporter of Moving to Work; but the language here is clearly authorizing language, and we

have not been accepting authorizing language at any point in this debate.

So, I would be very happy to work with the gentleman on the Moving to Work program, and urge him to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman. If PHAs move off the Moving to Work program, HUD must immediately solicit new applicants to keep the program at full force, and I hope this colloquy will eliminate confusion at HUD about the number of PHAs authorized to be designated as Moving to Work.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask to engage the chairman of Transportation and HUD in another colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I have serious concerns about the administration's proposal to increase the Federal Housing Administration's multifamily mortgage insurance premium by 35 percent for fiscal year 2008.

The administration proposed a similar increase last year, and rescinded it after hearing from Members of Congress and those in the industry most affected. I believe we again do not have sufficient information about the impact of this proposal on affordable rental housing for American workforces.

The chairman of the Financial Services Committee Mr. FRANK and I are currently circulating a letter to HUD among our colleagues opposing the increase in the premium. As of Monday, we have 106 Members of Congress on record opposing the increase. A similar letter sent to HUD was recently signed by 38 Senators.

We believe an increase in the premium will impact the communities where housing would be built as well as tenants in those projects. HUD needs to perform a full assessment of the likely impact of such a premium increase on the volume of multifamily rental housing development, and the consequential effects of higher financing costs on rents to be borne by moderate-income residents.

This thorough assessment of the potential adverse effects of the proposed premium increase needs to be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, giving Congress the opportunity to evaluate the proposal. This would need to happen before allowing the increase to go into effect by simple notice.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from California that I very much respect the passion

for which he is working on this along with the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, and I look forward to working with you on this issue as we proceed.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 127, line 3, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2008".

#### TITLE III

##### RELATED AGENCIES

##### ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, \$6,150,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

##### FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1111), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902, \$22,072,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

##### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) \$85,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments due in fiscal year 2008 only, on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

##### NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$119,800,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be for a multi-family rental housing program.

##### UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of con-

ference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, \$2,000,000.

Title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, is amended in section 209 by striking "2007" and inserting "2008".

#### TITLE IV GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 401. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2008 pay raises for programs funded in this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act or previous appropriations Acts.

SEC. 402. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 403. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 404. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2008, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates a new program; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress; (4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose; (5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; (6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or (7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the statement of the managers accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include: (1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year en-

acted level; (2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and (3) an identification of items of special congressional interest: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 406. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2008 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2008 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2009, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines.

SEC. 407. All Federal agencies and departments that are funded under this Act shall issue a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on all sole source contracts by no later than July 31, 2008. Such report shall include the contractor, the amount of the contract and the rationale for using a sole source contract.

SEC. 408. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or "new age" belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

□ 1345

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 409. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with an entity that does not participate in the basic pilot program described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. SESSIONS:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to support Amtrak's route with the highest loss, measured

by passenger per mile cost as based on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation's September 2006 Financial Performance of Routes Report.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It would eliminate funding for the absolute worst performing line at Amtrak, the Sunset Limited, which runs from New Orleans to Los Angeles.

In 1997, Congress passed the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act, which required that Amtrak operate without any Federal operating assistance after 2002. Despite this commonsense requirement that they cease their fiscal irresponsibility and mismanagement, since Amtrak was supposed to be operating free of Federal subsidy, it has, instead, cost the taxpayers \$3 billion in operating expenses.

Mr. Chairman, people tuned in on C-SPAN to watch this debate may be wondering what exactly this \$3 billion in taxpayer funding is paying for. Well, in the case of the Sunset Limited, it is being used to subsidize the travels of a very few passengers who want to take a train from New Orleans to Los Angeles.

The trip is scheduled to take 46 hours and 20 minutes to complete, that is, assuming the train is running on time. This occurrence is, however, exceedingly unlikely. According to Amtrak's most recent monthly performance report, the Sunset Limited was only on time 11 percent of the time. This makes the Sunset Limited the third worst on-time performer for any of Amtrak's 33 routes during 2007.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, taxpayers should be happy when the train is not running, though, because when it is, the route loses an average of almost \$30 million a year. This means that Amtrak and the American taxpayer lose \$0.57 per mile for each passenger on this train. For 2006, it cost the Federal Government \$524 per passenger on that route, more than revenue that was brought in.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is the first step to instilling just a small measure of fiscal discipline at Amtrak. Failure to do so will only allow Amtrak to continue misusing and wasting taxpayer dollars.

This amendment is supported by the National Taxpayers Union, Americans for Tax Reform, and Citizens Against Government Waste. I hope that all my colleagues will join me and those taxpayer advocates in saving the taxpayers from throwing more good money after bad on the Sunset Limited.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would like to point out to the gentleman that the bill before us includes language that requires the Secretary of Transportation to review and ultimately approve or deny grant requests for each train route as part of the grant agreement. When grant requests are submitted to the Secretary, they include a detailed financial analysis and revenue projections, and the Secretary then determines whether to approve the grant request for the specific train route.

I'd like to make another comment here. All too often we forget about rural areas. Rural communities deserve transportation choices. This line serves a number of rural areas in the South and Southwest. But I do again remind that the Secretary has the authority to review the financials in relation to a particular route and to approve or disapprove of grant requests.

Amtrak has made some good moves over the recent past. They've reduced their debt by \$500 million. They have exacted about \$100 million of savings so far in their effort to reduce the costs of the long-distance routes. They've increased the amount of State investment that's involved in these routes, and they continue to show better revenue and ridership.

But the route to deal with individual routes, the way to deal with individual routes is through the language that's already in the bill, and so I'm going to oppose the specific effort to eliminate one specific route when the route is already in place in the legislation for the Secretary to make that decision.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman who is the Chair of the subcommittee of the authorizing committee, Ms. BROWN.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, here we go again, trying to destroy passenger rail in this country. The United States used to be the best passenger rail system in the world. Now we're the caboose, and we don't even use cabooses anymore.

For far too long this Congress has given Amtrak just enough money to limp along, never giving them the funds they needed to make serious improvements in the system.

Amtrak was a first responder during Hurricane Katrina and used the Sunset Limited line to help evacuate thousands of gulf region residents while President Bush and his administration was nowhere to be found. Now they are becoming a key part of each State's future evacuation plan.

Every industrialized country in the world is investing heavily in rail infrastructure because they realize that this is the future of transportation. But, sadly, as their systems get bigger and

better, our system gets less and less money.

Vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for the remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thought we spent most of last night on amendments to kill the operating account of Amtrak and then kill the capital account of Amtrak. The only thing that wasn't offered was burial funds for Amtrak. But now comes the dismemberment amendment.

This route is part of a national passenger rail system. It's the only route connecting California to the Southwest, to the gulf, and on to Florida. This route touches one-third of the Nation's population. Many of the people living in those communities along this route have no other passenger transportation, mass transportation alternative than the Sunset Limited.

The gentleman from Texas talked about the time it takes to traverse that route. What he didn't say is that most of that time is spent by Amtrak on sidings waiting for freight rail trains to pass. Now, if you give passenger rail priority consideration on those routes, those trains would pass very quickly. We could cut a substantial, maybe a third or more of the time out of their passenger service.

What's happening here is, going back to the origins of Amtrak, when freight rail companies started as passenger rail service found they could make more money carrying freight than passengers, they were carrying U.S. mail on the overnight railway post office, they petitioned to the Interstate Commerce Commission to discontinue passenger service when U.S. Postal Service moved to carrying their mail by truck.

So one by one, they discontinued passenger rail service, dumped it all in the hands of the Federal Government.

We need to keep Amtrak servicing. Defeat this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point something out. Last night the committee, while most Members were able to leave for dinner, the committee had to stay here and work until 10 p.m.. Lots of Members didn't show up then to offer

their amendments, and so now we have a surplus of amendments that we still have to go through today.

Now, today, the committee is grinding through these amendments, and we've just hit a patch in the road where no Members were here to offer their amendments.

Under the House rules, the committee could have chosen to rise and we could have moved to final passage without considering any of the other amendments that are still pending. The committee chose not to do that, out of fairness.

But I want to point out that if Members want to tie up the committee's time ad nauseam on repetitive amendments, the same amendments on the same bills ad nauseam, then the least they can do is to be on the floor when those amendments are supposed to be offered. The next time there is such a gap, I will move to rise and move to final passage.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Belmont Complex in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund" (and specified for the Economic Development Initiative) is hereby reduced by \$300,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to have the Clerk read the amendment in these instances where there are very specific amendments applying to a specific project within the legislation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

□ 1400

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for their indulgence here. I just wanted to make sure that Members who have earmarks that are being challenged here have the ability to come to the floor and are able to defend them.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, would strike \$300,000 from funding for the Belmont Complex in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania.

The Belmont Complex is a local recreational center. It offers an Olympic-size swimming pool with a 150-foot

water slide and an indoor skating rink and arena. The center has an adult hockey team and also offers indoor soccer.

To generate money, the center sells advertising space on the ice. A dash-board ad costs about \$800. The center also charges \$5 a day for admission to the pool. Individual pool memberships for the summer season are also available, and they can run up to \$77.

But, apparently, despite all the available revenue streams, the Federal taxpayers are being asked to pay \$300,000 for this recreational center to rebuild or renovate the center.

The bad news is I don't think any of us are given a free pass. We aren't given a season pass. That is something that is just for the locals. I think the entire project should be for the locals.

Reading through this, it struck me that virtually every Member here in this body has probably a dozen or so of these recreational centers in their district that we could, with the same justification here, come to the Congress and say we need a Federal taxpayer subsidy for this. We are not charging enough for people to come in, where our local funds are low, so we are going to give the Federal taxpayer the chance to pay for it.

We simply can't do that, obviously. We can't fund all the recreational centers across the country. So why do we choose this one? Why do we pick winners and losers here? Is it just because there is a particularly powerful Member who is behind it who can say, hey, I am going to get funds for my district for this recreational center? What happens to all the other ones? What do you tell the recreational center down the street just across the district line? You're out of luck? You have to charge more for your season passes?

It just doesn't seem fair to me. This isn't the road we should go down. And if we have turned over a new leaf, and we are doing something different in terms of earmarks, then let's do something different instead of the same old same old.

We are told that we are going to have a process that vets these a little better. There are, I believe, about 1,500 earmarks in this bill. We just got word of what they were just a couple of days ago. And so it just doesn't seem that the process is changing all that much. It looks too much now like it did when Republicans were in charge.

So I think that we ought to change it, and that is why I am offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman offering this amendment doesn't happen to be here at the moment; so let me try to point out what is involved here.

Yes, the Belmont Complex does provide recreational opportunities and conference and meeting space. Yes, it is a facility that is used for Chamber of Commerce meetings, and banquets, and business, and seminars, and training and testing for displaced workers, and local union meetings and negotiations, emergency rescue training, voter registration drives, local business-to-business job fairs.

In the county, Armstrong County in Pennsylvania, which is one of those in the northern part of Appalachia that is struggling hard, losing population, by the way, if I remember the map exactly correctly. I was from Pennsylvania in an earlier period of my lifetime. These are all purposes that are important to the process of keeping the economy going in that community and that county.

But most important to this particular earmark is that a 2003 fire damaged much of the building, and these funds are needed to make continual interior and exterior renovations and to make the facility handicapped-accessible. Those are important specific things that go beyond the other bits and pieces that are pulled together in this complex. The main building within the complex has had fire damage and needs this money for repair.

Now, I just want to point out that the great explosion, the truly irresponsible explosion, of congressional earmarking began shortly after the party which is in the minority gained control of the Congress in 1995. And so during that period of time, we have gone from zero earmarking in the Labor, Health, and Education budget to over \$1 billion a year. We have tripled the number of earmarks in the defense bill. The number of earmarks in this legislation, while it has been reorganized a couple times, has gone up in similar kind of proportion. Yet this year, this year, we are reducing the number of earmarks and the number of dollars involved in those earmarks by 50 percent from what they were under the last time that a budget was put through completely with earmarks under the leadership of the gentleman's party. So we are trying to clean up a mess and get a good strong measure of the earmarking process.

But this one, I think, is legitimate for its purposes, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, let me just say if you can justify this earmark for a recreational center to help them basically defray cost of memberships or to rebuild or renovate, you could do that for any recreational center in the country. There is nothing that I can see, and I wish the sponsor of the amendment would have come to the floor to actually defend it or shed some light on what makes this special, why there is a Federal nexus here that doesn't exist with other recreational centers across the country. I wish we

could have had that debate or not. So we have to assume that this is no different than any recreational center anywhere in the country. So if you can justify this one, you can justify any of them. And we simply can't afford that, and we shouldn't continue just to say, well, we have cut the number of earmarks or dollar value in half. I mean, we are trying to get back to fiscal sobriety here after a binge that took place for years, and I admitted that that binge was my party. But if we are trying to get back to sobriety, it doesn't count to say, all right, we are only going to drink half as much this year as we did before. That's just not acceptable.

This process is out of control. It remains out of control. And this earmark is a great example of that. If we can approve earmarks for this kind of thing, anything goes. Katy bar the door.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak on any of these earmarks, but the discussion that has gone on between the chairman and the gentleman from Arizona I was listening to upstairs, and it struck me that there needed to be some addition to this discussion.

The suggestion that earmarks exploded as of the time the control of the Congress changed in 1995 and began to expand, et cetera, et cetera, is accurate, accurate, but for reasons entirely different than the gentleman from Arizona either realizes or understands.

It is a fact that the other party controlled the Congress for 40 years, and over all those years their chairmen, their subcommittee chairmen, their very high-ranking Members around here with years and years of power had developed very solid relationships with the second and third level in the various agencies around this town. And there weren't earmarks; there were phone marks. Key staff and otherwise were instructed to call those second- and third-tier people within the agencies and let them know what they thought the priorities should be. There wasn't a need for legislative earmarks because phone marks had a very significant impact upon the process. And we tend to ignore that reality.

When the majority did change, the new majority found that that second and third level of bureaucracy weren't nearly as responsive to people with Rs after their name, or Republicans, and thus they began giving some specific direction as to what their priorities were, thus the term called "earmarks."

Further, I think the gentleman does his party a disservice by suggesting that this was our fault. The reality is that even the earmarks where they are represent in the neighborhood of 1 percent of all the discretionary spending available in the appropriations process,

and that while the Constitution says that appropriations should begin in the House of Representatives, to suggest that Members having ideas as to what priorities ought to be and even putting it in legislation is wrong, it seems to me, in connection with that, the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEINER). The gentleman from Arizona has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, let me just respond.

The truth is we went from about, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee often points out, from zero earmarks in Labor-HHS to some 1,400 last week. Much of that was under my party.

I think Democrats are as much to blame probably as Republicans are. The difference is as Republicans, we pretend to stand for limited government. We should be saying this isn't what we should be doing. If the agencies are out of control, we need to rein them in through the oversight process rather than to try to compete with them in terms of wasteful spending.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this issue either, but I feel required to respond to one thing that the gentleman from Arizona said.

He indicated that it was too bad that he had only had 2 or 3 days during which time he could review the earmarks in this bill. I simply want to say if he feels badly about that and wants to know why that is the case, all he has to do is look in the mirror along with a number of his other colleagues.

Why do I say that? Because I tried about a month ago to make clear to the House that I thought the Appropriations Committee staff had had insufficient time to take a look at and screen a number of these earmarks, especially those that came early in the process. So I offered up another option, and what I proposed is that the committee simply be given more time to screen those earmarks, and that before the Congress adjourned in August, we would then publish all of them, and any persons who had doubts about them would have more than 30 days over the August recess, and our staffs could have reviewed each and every one of them for a much longer period of time.

The gentleman and others on that side of the aisle chose to belittle that proposal, suggesting that we were trying to, quote, "hide earmarks until conference." Not so. All we were trying

to do was to give the staff and any Members who were interested additional time in which to review those earmarks. Our friends on the other side decided that they would rather criticize than agree to that, and so we acquiesced in their desires to have earmarks in each bill as they came to the floor.

□ 1415

We felt that there would be ample protection for Members because we also included a reform that would have required persons in the conference to be present and voting on every single item rather than having to endure what has happened in the past when large amounts of legislation were slipped into conference reports without a vote of the conference after the conference is over. But our judgment was not followed, and so as a result, we have this very limited time for Members to review projects as they come through in regular order. I'm sorry about that. But I would say to the gentleman, no one in this House can have it both ways. We've tried to accommodate the wishes of the House. Either way, we're doing the best we can. And if the gentleman doesn't like it, I think, as I say, all he has to do is look in the mirror because it was comments from people like him that required us to follow this procedure in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Walter Clore Wine and Culinary Center in Prosser, Washington.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund" (and specified for the Economic Development Initiative) is hereby reduced by \$250,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.



The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Let me just say, in response to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, this isn't the best process. I appreciate having a couple of days and being able to come to the floor. The problem is, under what was proposed by the chairman, we would have had more time, yes, but we wouldn't have had the ability to challenge individual earmarks. So that was a trade-off that we were unwilling to make. And I still maintain that we made the best decision here. But I think it would be nice to have more than a couple of days to actually look at these, but I appreciate that the Appropriations Committee is doing so.

This amendment would prohibit \$250,000 in Federal funds from going to the Walter Clore Wine and Culinary Center in Prosser, Washington, and reduce the cost of the bill by a consistent amount.

I'm sure people like to be wine and dined, but I think this earmark goes a little too far. I think that this is another example of, if we can justify economic development here, then we can justify just about anything.

We often complain that the Federal Government, the agencies spend willy-nilly, they're wasting money here, they're wasting money there. They are, certainly. One amendment that I wanted to bring today but got it too late would be one to simply cut the account that provides economic development earmarks because I think the Federal agencies do waste money in this regard. But instead of reining that account in and saying you shouldn't be doing that, we're kind of competing with them and saying we're going to do our own economic development earmarks. I just fail to see a Federal nexus that exists here that wouldn't exist with other organizations.

You can justify anything in terms of economic development. The act of spending money by itself inherently means there is economic development. But where do we choose? Do we just choose this one or that one? It just doesn't seem to be a very good process, particularly without a real Federal nexus here.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I think the gentleman, in his opening remarks, said something that currently should be expanded. Current law within HUD has an Office of Economic Development, and its responsibility, and I want to quote what its responsibility is, it "works with public and private sectors as well as not-for-profit organizations to provide financial and technical assistance to local communities to develop and implement their

own economic development and community revitalization strategies." Now, that's current law. If the gentleman believes that that agency shouldn't exist, then certainly he can introduce a bill, and we can have a worthy debate on that. But that is existing law.

And it is within that context, then, as this relates to my district, which is a very diverse agriculture area, labor intensive in many of the specialty crops, but there is a new industry that is emerging in my district, and that is the wine industry. It's only about 35 years old. Historically, the wine industry in this country has always been in California. This is emerging in my district, and it has the benefit, then, of economic development to expand, to bring more tourists into this area, which means there's more hotels, more restaurants. That is the very definition of what economic development is all about.

So let me be very, very clear on this. This project is fully consistent with requirements for projects normally and routinely funded under this program and existing programs.

And I might add, it is named for an individual who has been widely recognized as the father of the Washington wine industry. He is the one who convinced farmers to transfer some of their lands to growing wine grapes. And, frankly, they've been very successful.

There has been \$5 million raised by other governmental agencies and quasi-governmental agencies to build this center. This is part of that. What it demonstrates to me is that there is a strong commitment of this wide community that identifies this as a local economic development project.

So while there has been a lot of discussion with the earmarks this year, and I suspect we will have more of those discussions, I firmly believe that within existing laws and within the context of economic development, this falls into a category that I feel very, very comfortable with in saying that we ought to earmark dollars for this center because it will expand the economic development in this largely rural area that I have the privilege of representing. So, to me, it is an example of what the economic development initiative is supposed to be.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, Washington wine industry revenues are estimated at about \$3 billion a year. The industry employs, I believe, about 11,000 people. Over 2 million people visit Washington wineries every year. That's just the point I was making. This is an industry that does pretty well. And I just wonder why the Federal taxpayer has to be involved here.

Public/private partnerships, there is nothing bad about that on its face; but not every public/private partnership is justified, particularly when that partner is the Federal Government. I just still fail to see a nexus.

And, again, we should actually be providing more oversight of the Federal agencies that expend these economic development grants because a lot of it is wasted. I'm sure a lot of it is wasted in my own district. But we shouldn't be trying to compete with that account by earmarking our own funds.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, let me restate again that it is existing law within HUD of this office that provides for economic development. I am simply following the law and exercising my right as a Member of Congress, who is part of the writing of the appropriation bills, to earmark what I think is important for my district.

Now, if the gentleman wants to, as I mentioned in my previous remarks, if he wants to have a debate on whether that office ought to exist, well, I think that is worthy of debate. In fact, I would have suggested to the gentleman that maybe he should have defunded completely the whole office; therefore, he could have been at least consistent rather than picking out one project that I think is worthy, following what the requirements are of the Economic Development Office.

So with that, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the Flake amendment as it relates to the Walter Clore Center.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission in Wausau, Wisconsin.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund" (and specified for neighborhood initiatives) is hereby reduced by \$400,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, as mentioned, this amendment would strike \$400,000 in the bill from the North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.



According to the certification letter submitted by the sponsor, the commission will receive Federal funding to establish the Technology Revolving Loan Fund.

According to the Web site, the commission is a public agency dedicated to providing professional services to local governments. These services include economic development, geographic information systems, intergovernmental cooperation, land use planning, and transportation. The commission's funding comes from Federal grants and State and local money.

This earmark brings up a lot of questions. First and foremost, why is this fund being created in one particular part of Wisconsin? I'm sure every Member of Congress would love to establish a revolving loan fund to help their local businesses. If it is deserving of Federal aid, why aren't others? Again, why do we pick and choose here?

Can the sponsor of this earmark assure us that once this is done, that once these monies are loaned out, that more monies won't be sought? Is this an earmark that will beget more earmarks? It seems that these are questions that should be answered. It's a dangerous slippery slope, I think, if we use Federal taxpayer dollars for parochial revolving loan funds.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I seek to control the time in opposition, and I reserve my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, here is just another example, and maybe the sponsor of the earmark can enlighten us, but as to what makes this different, what makes this deserving of Federal funds? Why are we helping to set up a local revolving loan fund for local businesses? What is to stop every Member of Congress from wanting that in their own district? Isn't this a slippery slope if we just allow taxpayer money to be used in this fashion? If you can use it for economic development, if that is the criterion, any spending is justified.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman has indicated, this provides funds for a revolving loan fund for North Central Regional Planning Commission. The purpose is to provide small low-interest loans for small business start-ups or expansions. It is targeted to enterprises which have little access to capital and need to change the technology which they use in production.

The planning commission is established by county governments under State statutory authority. It provides zoning and economic development assistance to counties. The planning commission covers a 10-county area and three congressional districts, mine, the gentleman from the eighth, Mr. KAGEN, formerly Mr. GREEN, and also Mr. PETRI's district.

Why are we providing funds for this area? Very simple: this is an economi-

cally challenged area. And I make no apology whatsoever in trying to provide some modest assistance to the area. We have a similar fund in two other parts of my congressional district. In Chippewa County, for instance, 3 years ago we established a similar fund.

□ 1430

That fund has saved 58 jobs in the area. They have provided grants, very small grants, to businesses in question, and they have already received \$200,000 in repayments. All of the repayments are current.

But I want to ask a series of questions about the gentleman's district. I make no apology for trying to provide small loans to domestic small business entrepreneurs. In the 10 years that I chaired the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I learned very quickly the value of small loans rather than large, megadevelopment projects. I see no reason why we shouldn't provide those same lessons here at home.

I find it ironic that someone from Arizona would challenge economic development funds in Wisconsin. Arizona ranks 24th in the Nation in per capita Federal dollars spent in Arizona; Wisconsin ranks 48th. So the gentleman is exactly twice as well off in terms of State ranking than my own State. Arizona receives \$41 billion in Federal funds out of the budget; my State receives \$31 billion. Arizona receives \$7,300 per person; Wisconsin receives \$5,675 per person. That is a \$1,600 per capita difference.

Eighty-five percent of the difference in what our two States get is due to differences in Federal salaries and in procurement. Arizona gets \$7 billion more out of the Federal Government because of money spent for procurement than does the State of Wisconsin. In fact, Arizona gets a lot more money than all of the States in the upper Midwest. Arizona, as I said, ranks 24th. Wisconsin ranks 48th in per capita expenditure, Michigan ranks 47th, Minnesota 49th, Illinois 46th, Indiana 45th.

On a per capita basis, Arizona gets 28 percent more out of the Federal budget than does Wisconsin. It gets 22 percent more per capita than does Michigan, 29 percent more than does Minnesota, 21 percent more than does Illinois, and 20 percent more than does Indiana.

Let me also point out that I doubt very much that the Arizona delegation doesn't work very hard to see to it that giant defense contractors like Raytheon, Boeing, Honeywell and General Dynamics together receive almost \$4 billion in funding from the Federal Government. I doubt very much that the delegations from those States don't work to get that money in their States. So I make no apology for this tiny pittance that we are trying to provide for my own State.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to say, however, I think it comes with considerable ill grace for someone from Arizona to question the expenditure of

\$400,000 in Wisconsin, when Arizona has been the principal recipient of the second largest Federal earmark in the history of earmarking in this country, the Central Arizona Project. For Arizona, we have already spent \$4.3 billion. The total cost of that project is expected to be \$5.6 billion. The President's request is at \$27 million this year.

Mr. Chairman, that seems to me to be the pot calling the kettle black. I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to continue my observations about what the gentleman receives from the Federal budget. The Republican Study Committee said that the \$1.5 billion that was provided to the D.C. subway was the largest earmark in history. In fact, the Arizona project is almost four times as large as the D.C. subway. Yet the gentleman is complaining about a tiny \$400,000 economic assistance grant for my State.

I would also simply note that the median household income in the gentleman's district is \$48,000. The median household income in my own district is \$39,000, a \$9,000 difference. A good portion of that higher median income lies in the fact that Arizona has a very large number of Federal installations in the gentleman's State. Fort Huachuca and several other Air Force bases inject enough funds to provide employment for 9,000 additional people, yet the gentleman is objecting to a small revolving loan fund which provides help in keeping about 50 jobs in Wisconsin.

I make no apology in trying to get the median family income in my district just a mite closer to the much higher income found in the gentleman's district.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a colloquy to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the subcommittee, for this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, in New Jersey, and all over the country, certain waste handlers and railroad companies have tried to exploit a supposed loophole in Federal law in order to set up unregulated waste transfer facilities.

Under the Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act of 1995, the Surface Transportation Board, or STB, has exclusive jurisdiction over transportation by rail carriers and the ability to grant Federal preemption over other laws at any level, local, State or Federal, that might impede such transportation. But Congress intended such authority to extend only to transportation by rail, not to the operation of facilities that are merely sited next to rail operations or have a business connection to a rail company.

Unfortunately, certain companies have exploited this loophole to build or plan waste transfer stations next to rail lines and avoid any regulation from State or local authorities.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Senate's efforts to close this loophole. They have passed an amendment in their version of the fiscal year 2008 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, and I wanted to thank your subcommittee for recognizing this important issue in this bill's report language.

I had intended to offer an amendment, which I will not offer at this time, that would take the STB out of the waste management business by ensuring that funding for any decisions relating to waste transfer stations be eliminated. Again, you have dealt with this in the bill's report language, so it is not necessary to move this amendment at this time. But it is important that States and local municipalities have some say in this process.

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to add a word of my support of Mr. PALLONE's amendment. The issue of companies circumventing the law and the wishes of cities and towns in this Nation deserves to be addressed.

In my district, in Bensalem, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, a firm wanted to build a waste transfer station. Given the potential environmental and health risks, both the local community and even the State voiced their objections to the proposal. As an end run around this, the rail company that would service the proposed waste transfer facility applied to the Federal Surface Transportation Board, or the STB, to, in effect, have the waste transfer facility declared a rail facility. This was an attempt to supersede the rulings of the State and local entities that had already rejected the proposed waste transfer station. Fortunately, the rail company's application was rejected, but they can reapply to the STB at any time.

Just yesterday I stood with Bensalem Mayor Joe DiGirolamo and Pennsylvania State Representative Gene

DiGirolamo and opposed this facility. Mr. Chairman, people in the local, State and Federal level are all opposed to this end run around the law.

Mr. Chairman, when Congress created the STB, it was never intended to allow decisions by the STB to be used to override the wishes of cities and towns across the country, and certainly not as a means of superseding health and environmental regulations of State and local governments. Yet that is exactly what is happening.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his excellent leadership on this issue, and thank Chairman OLVER for providing me the opportunity to speak today and stand up for the residents of Bensalem and the Eighth District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLVER. To continue the colloquy, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues from New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Communities in my home in New York, including the village of Croton-on-Hudson in my district, are also being threatened by companies who are hoping to exploit this loophole through the STB to process solid waste without facing regulation under environmental protection laws. This type of activity is clearly outside the mission and the purview of the Surface Transportation Board, and I look forward to working with my colleagues and chairman to affirm that reality.

I thank the chairman and the gentleman from New Jersey for their leadership and look forward to working as we go forward with you.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, to respond to this, last night, as the gentleman from New Jersey has already pointed out, we had an amendment being offered which was subject to a point of order. I had agreed that I would be happy to work with him, and I obviously will be very happy to work with the three Members who are part of this colloquy from New Jersey, from Pennsylvania and from New York, on this issue, which is an important issue and would require authorization legislation to do, and that is why the point of order lay last night.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, I will be happy to work with the three gentleman who have spoken on this issue as we go on toward conference.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the National Forest Recreation Association in Woodlake, California.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund" (and specified for the Economic Development Initiative) is hereby reduced by \$50,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

Let me first respond. I had yielded back my time when the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about Arizona, the Central Arizona Project as an earmark.

Perhaps in the debate at the time it was called an earmark, but it doesn't fit the contemporary definition of earmark. There was no project over the history of this body probably that wasn't debated through authorization, appropriation, followed up by oversight, than a project like that. I would have no complaint if some of the projects that we are challenging here today went through that process of authorization, appropriation and oversight, but that isn't what this is about.

The contemporary practice of earmarking that we have fallen into, under Republicans and Democrats, has been to circumvent the careful process of authorization, appropriation and oversight. So that is the complaint here. So bringing up the Central Arizona Project whenever an amendment is offered to take funding away from an economic development in a local community is a specious argument, I would add.

This amendment would prohibit \$50,000 in Federal funds from being used by the National Forest Recreation Association for the National Mule and Packer Museum and would reduce the cost of the bill by a consistent amount.

According to the earmark description and certification letter submitted to the Appropriations Committee, the funding would be used for the construction of a museum to memorialize and help to preserve the role of mule teams and mule packers in opening and developing the West.

□ 1445

The funding, however, will go to the National Forest Recreation Association. Obviously, you cannot build much for \$50,000. I assume there is a partnership with local entities.

There is much that we don't know about this. Does the location exist? Will it be owned by the National Forest Recreation Association? Are there corporate sponsors? How much is the total cost of the museum? Will the Federal taxpayer be asked to pay more later on?

It seems there is a 20-mule team museum in Boren, California. This is at least the second mule and packer museum we know of. Does that one receive Federal funding?

I would simply say it is time for the American taxpayer to say "whoa" and

stand up for fiscal sanity and actually stop the practice of earmarking like we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to rise in opposition to this amendment. As Mr. HASTINGS said earlier, there is in current law the Office of Economic Development, which has the responsibility of working with public and private sectors, as well as not-for-profit organizations, to provide financial and technical assistance to local communities to develop and implement their own economic development in their community. That's current law.

If we want to change that, I agree with much of what the gentleman has to say, I just think this is not the right time and place to be covering it in this manner. But it gives me a little bit of a chance to talk about my district, and all 435 of us, I think, love to have the opportunity to talk about our districts.

I have a map here which shows my district. It is the second largest district in California, a little over 21,000 square miles. I live down here. This is Nevada. This is central to northern California. It is about 450 miles this way, a couple hundred miles this way. A little perspective: eight States would fit within this county, one of the largest counties.

In this county, the town of Bishop, some of the community people have every year for the last 40 years celebrated what they call Mule Days, and about 50,000 people come to this community of 3,500 people. In this whole county that I said eight States would fit in, about 17,000 people live, and about 3,500 people live in the town of Bishop. They are great people.

Here are the eastern Sierras, Death Valley. We have the lowest spot in the 48 States and the highest spot. Death Valley is 280 feet below sea level, and we have Mount Whitney that is about 15,000 feet above sea level. It is a great district, just as each of your districts are.

Several years ago, and actually they have been working on this for a few years, Bob Tanner and some of the people in Bishop thought that they should have a museum to celebrate the mules. Ninety-five percent of this county is owned by Federal and local governments. They don't have any room. There are only a few acres in this town that could even be developed. They don't have the land to develop for economic development. They rely totally on tourism, restaurants, motels, packers that take people up into the mountains. Mules have been an important part of this, and they want to establish a museum. They are asking for \$50,000. L.A. City is going to donate \$2 million worth of land, 8 acres. The county and

the city are putting up a little over a million and a half dollars, and the people that live there are going to raise another hundred, \$250,000.

One thing that I think we forget is that the people in Bishop pay taxes. They pay Federal taxes, and I guarantee you that during the time that Jerry represented them and the time I have had the opportunity to represent them, they have gotten very little back from the Federal Government for the taxes that they have sent here to Washington.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEON. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Indeed, this territory was a part of my district for some time, and the people are incredibly wonderful people. They reflect the best of the American West. And there is no doubt that they are the best and they are there in the West in no small part because of the mule.

I must say that the gentleman is making a very, very important point. It is a long, long ways away from somebody else's district to become an expert in terms of a subject like this. It causes me just to smile, and so I intend to help the gentleman if I possibly can by voting "no" on this amendment.

Mr. McKEON. I thank the gentleman.

Let me tell you a little bit about mules because this is one of the things that they are going to honor in this museum. George Washington introduced mules into our country. He received a jack donkey in 1786 from the King of Spain, and he started breeding and using mules. Within a few years, he had 58 mules working on his plantation a few miles south in Mount Vernon.

Since then, mules have been used to develop the West. All across the Nation, they helped the pioneers move. They could go 30 miles a day where wagon trains could only go about 5. They were an integral part of the development of this country. Even today, we have 600 mules on special assignment serving in Afghanistan helping the Army do the things that they helped the Army do 100 years ago.

I think \$50,000, you know, is a good contribution to give to these people, the money that they have sent back here.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the gentleman from Arizona for the opportunity to come to the floor to discuss the American Mule and Packer Museum and the economic development impact it will have on my district.

Let me first start by saying that this \$50,000 is not included in this bill to laud the humble and noble mule. These funds will be used to boost tourism dollars in the small city of Bishop, CA by helping to build a local heritage museum.

The city of Bishop is located in Inyo County—which is geographically one of the largest counties in the country and is 95 percent owned by the federal government. Bishop is a classic western frontier city and has been

squeezed out of all other industries by the encroachment of federal land, which literally surrounds it and limits the community to survival on tourism dollars. Those vitally important dollars come from visitors eager to see the great Wild West, ride out like our forefathers into the Eastern Sierra, enjoy the natural beauty on a hike, or hire a mule packer to explore the federal forests in the area.

The \$50,000 dollar grant contained in this bill for the American Mule Museum is a modest federal investment in a worthy economic development project and a good example of how federal seed money is leveraged to develop local projects.

Every year, at the fairgrounds on Main Street, the small city of Bishop hosts a famous and popular heritage festival known as "Mule Days." Some communities have an Apple Harvest festival, some have Frontier Days. In Bishop, we celebrate "Mule Days." My friend from Arizona may not be familiar with the essential role Packers and their trusted mules had to the settlement of the west, but California's home state President did. Next to me is a picture of then-Governor Ronald Reagan acting as the Grand Marshall to the Bishop Mule Days parade in 1974.

Mule Days is the single largest draw to that community, bringing fifty thousand Californians and tourists interested in frontier life into downtown Bishop, where they shop, dine and stay during the festival. In addition to honoring their history, this museum would help expand that tourism by drawing folks in year-round, rather than just during the long Memorial Day weekend Mule Days celebration. The City of Los Angeles, a longtime landholder in our northern county, is going to donate an estimated 8 acres, valued at \$2,000,000 for the project. Inyo County will spend an additional \$1.5 million with the hook-ups, parking lots and access roads. Finally, this federal grant, directed to National Forest and Recreation Association, in Woodlake, CA (the non-profit overseeing the project) and private fundraising will be used towards the excavation and reconstruction of the famed Livermore Packing Station, and the surrounding corrals in Bishop.

There is a federal interest in preserving the history of how the West was settled. There are many residents in the city and surrounding areas who are direct descendants of those pioneers who headed west. A museum dedicated to local heritage and mule packers that were so important to the founding of the area will be a proper place to preserve their artifacts and documents into the future.

The residents of the City of Bishop, my constituents and federal tax payers are dependent on tourism dollars for their city funds. There are 480 separate EDI projects listed in the THUD bill ranging from \$50,000 up to \$500,000 with the majority of projects falling in the \$100 K to \$200 K range. The projects, with a few exceptions, are for the planning, land purchase, construction or renovation of facilities deemed to be important to economic development in both rural and urban areas. The construction of a museum celebrating local history is a common theme throughout many of the projects. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and help preserve a piece of American history in a place that is deserving of federal assistance.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the gentleman very much. As you can see, when I start talking about my district, I get pretty excited. I have a lot of good things to say about it.

Bishop is a classic western frontier city. It has been squeezed out of all other big industries by all of the other public lands that are owned around them, and they have to survive on tourism. So if they can add this museum, it will help their tourism and it will help bring people there year-round, which will benefit their economy.

In closing, let me say that this is a partnership. It is not just Federal dollars, even though there is no such thing as "Federal dollars." It all comes out of our pockets, and the people in Bishop pay those Federal dollars back here.

But as I mentioned earlier, the City of Los Angeles is going to participate by donating the land which is worth \$2 million. Inyo County will spend an additional \$1.5 million to work on the project, and local people will raise the difference.

The final thing I wanted to say is that there are 480 separate economic development projects in this bill. According to current law, that is what the law required. The chairman and the ranking member have gone through, their staffs, they have evaluated all of the projects requested. Bob Tanner and his friends in Bishop that requested this project wrote up their project. They sent it to me and Senator FEINSTEIN. We included it in the request. They were one of the ones chosen, one of the 480. These projects range from \$50,000, this is the smallest, to \$500,000, with the majority falling between \$100,000 and \$200,000.

The projects, with few exceptions, are for planning, land purchase, construction or renovation of facilities deemed to be important to economic development in both rural and urban areas. This is a very rural area. The construction of a museum celebrating local history is a common theme throughout many of these projects. We followed the law. We did the things that are asked of us. I think this is a worthy project.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for including it in this bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank my friend from California for representing the people of Inyo County so well since I had to leave them in the last redistricting. I intend to support your position.

Mr. MCKEON. If the gentleman would continue to yield, one final thing.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Is that Ronald Reagan on a mule?

Mr. MCKEON. Ronald Reagan led the Mule Days parade in 1974, riding a mule in the Mule Days parade.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Could it possibly be? Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman brought up Ronald Reagan. I think it was Reagan, when he was presented with the highway bill back in 1987, that had, I believe, around 150 earmarks as opposed to the highway bill we did later, in 2005, with 6,300. He said at that time, "I haven't seen this much lard since I gave away ribbons at the county fair." So Ronald Reagan certainly recognized that Congress, at least at that stage, before we even got into the contemporary practice of earmarking, was out of control.

I would also like to make the point, and I am glad that the gentleman mentioned, there is no such thing as Federal money. It is money given by the taxpayer to the Federal Government. Some of it funds the core functions of government. Some of it is spent on things that I don't think are the core function of government, and I don't think most taxpayers around the country do either, when you say this money is being returned, but it is not. As long as we are running a deficit, which is now 2, \$300 billion, then the money is borrowed to pay for projects like this.

I simply don't think that we are giving the taxpayer a fair shake. I think we should stubbornly refuse to fund this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Huntsville Museum of Art in Huntsville, Alabama.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund" (and specified for the Economic Development Initiative) is hereby reduced by \$200,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would prevent \$200,000 from being used to fund the Huntsville Museum of Art in Huntsville, Alabama, and would reduce the cost of the bill by a corresponding amount.

Mr. Chairman, there are, I think, 480 earmarks funded in the Economic Development Initiative account, at least 11 proposed to fund museums. There stands about a million dollars total for museums. This doesn't take into account projects described as cultural centers and other various exhibits.

The spending initiatives do not illustrate any sort of restraint on our part on the Federal level. In the past, we have funded Faulkner museums, teapot museums. This year we are funding museums about mules and hunting and fishing museums. The Huntsville Museum of Art was named as one of the State of Alabama's top destinations by the Alabama Bureau of Tourism and Travel. They bring as many as 23,000 visitors for a single exhibit.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, all of us have museums in our districts. All of those museums, I'm sure, if given the opportunity, would take Federal money to defray some of their costs. We simply can't fund all of them.

I don't know why we have the account in the agency. Like I said, we should go after that one, but here we have to show some restraint. And every once in a while, I think the taxpayer would appreciate if we actually stopped funding for some of these earmarks.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on behalf of this project that Mr. FLAKE has attacked here. I'm the offerer of this project, the Huntsville Museum of Art, located in the city of Huntsville, Alabama, the largest city in my congressional district. This is a museum project that I think is very appropriate to the economic development initiative account.

This museum chose to locate in the downtown area of the city of Huntsville some years ago. In the 1950s, early 1960s, the city of Huntsville's population was around 30,000 people. Currently its population is close to 200,000 people, but like many downtown areas, our downtown had deteriorated. It was a target for crime. It was a target for all kinds of movement there that would not have been in the best interests of the core of a city of this size.

The Museum of Art chose to locate its new facility there. It partnered with the community. It raised \$8 million to build this facility that it's in. It is now in another expansion because of the success of the downtown area, because

of the momentum that it helped create. Students are coming into the downtown area. People are coming into there from the region 100 miles around the area, and it's really caused the city of Huntsville to renovate and revise its downtown area. Business is coming back, and I think in terms of economic developments issues, it's accomplishing just what it should accomplish.

So I'm eager to defend this amendment and say that currently the \$200,000 that we've been able to achieve through the economic development initiative, through this committee, and I thank the chairman and the staff and the ranking member and the staff for considering this project, will go along with another \$8 million that will be raised from the community so that we can create exhibition space, so that we can create meeting space. This is not a routine museum expansion that this \$200,000 will go toward. It's a small amount of money that will be pooled with another amount of money to renovate a downtown area that is in much need of renovation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I just will close on this one, saying again this is one of many museums that we are funding here. We simply can't fund them all. At some point it would be nice to give the taxpayers a gift and actually say we're not going to fund a particular earmark. We did it a couple of weeks ago.

This is not an idle process. We've had one occasion already where I've come to offer an earmark, and the sponsor of the earmark beat me to the floor and offered an amendment to revoke his own earmark. So obviously there needed to be more vetting of that earmark. I would assume that there are others like it.

So this is a process we should go through. I would urge support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into the debate on this specific project, but I again want to simply note that I find it interesting that the gentleman from Arizona is questioning small economic development programs in other States when, in fact, as I said earlier, the second largest earmark in the history of the Congress is the Central Arizona Project, upon which we have already spent not \$4.3 million, but \$4.3 billion, total cost estimated to be \$5.6 billion.

And I also have in my hand, as a certain Senator from my own State used to say, 61 pages of military contracts that are let to firms in Arizona. We don't have in our State something like Fort Huachuca or Luke or Davis Air Force Base, and I'm sure that if we did,

we would be experiencing the benefit to our economy that the gentleman's State is experiencing.

But I wonder if the gentleman has any idea what the \$44,000 was spent on in a contract with Two Pals and a Gal?

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I have no clue.

Mr. OBEY. I don't either. It would be interesting to find out. That's another expenditure in Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. If the gentleman would further yield for a minute, perhaps the gentleman wasn't on the floor last week. I actually challenged an earmark that was going largely to my own district.

Arizona is just like other States in this regard. I don't object to projects that go through the process. I assume that the Central Arizona Project had a hearing or two. It was authorized and went through the process. What I object to is the contemporary practice of earmarks.

Mr. OBEY. Taking back my time, I was here when we went through all of that with the Central Arizona Project, and I assure you that the project was not approved because of the merits. It was approved because of the persistence of the Arizona delegation, and if anyone thinks that a little politics didn't go into determining that \$4.5 billion project, I'd like to sell them a couple of bridges.

So, all I can say is it is fine for someone who comes from a district as prosperous as yours to belittle or question these modest economic development efforts that are being provided around the country in districts that have a per family income of \$8,000, \$9,000, \$10,000 less than yours. This is, after all, one country.

And just as I believe that the most fortunate human beings in this country ought to be willing to extend a helping hand for those who are least fortunate, I also think that those communities that are well off ought to be able to extend a helping hand to the communities that are less well off, and that certainly is the case with the number of the economic development projects that this committee is trying to fund, recognizing that we are, after all, all one country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, just briefly in close, this is a modest economic development initiative. It's very appropriate under this account, and it will allow this museum project to revitalize an area of downtown that is in much need of revitalization.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the requirement under section 12(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437j(c)); relating to community service).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer this on behalf of myself and our colleague from New York Mr. RANGEL, who, in fact, in a previous Congress in 2002, I believe, offered a similar amendment. It would suspend for a year, because we do this 1 year at a time, the work requirement in the public housing sector. We're talking about 8 hours a month.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to accept this amendment on the part of Mr. FRANK and Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I'm certainly prepared for it to be accepted.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection. We have no objection. We accept the amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I will go make a great speech in my office.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Hunting and Fishing Museum of Pennsylvania in Tionesta, Pennsylvania.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund" (and specified for the Economic Development Initiative) is hereby reduced by \$100,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the

gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, just once I would love to hear the other side say, we have no objection to that amendment and will accept it, but I suppose I won't be so lucky today.

This amendment would prevent \$100,000 in funding for the Hunting and Fishing Museum in Pennsylvania and reduce the cost of the bill by a corresponding amount.

Mr. Chairman, my staff and I have never had a hard time fishing for earmarks that seem to be fiscally irresponsible, but this one seemed to be a particularly easy catch. It seems that there is no museum that we will not fund. We have funded teapot museums. We've funded mule museums. We have funded rock and roll halls of fame. Now, we're being asked to fund a museum honoring the time-honored hobbies of hunting and fishing.

According to the earmark description, the earmark would fund the development and creation of interactive, educational and historical exhibits. According to the Web site for the Hunting and Fishing Museum, the museum came as a result of its location in a forest area of Pennsylvania where hunting and fishing are already big industries.

I enjoy fishing and hunting as much as the next person, but I'm not convinced that the Federal Government has a role here. I'd like to have explained what the Federal nexus is.

According to the National Association for Sporting Goods, the hunting industry did \$2.8 billion in business sales in 2004. For fiscal year 2003, the fishing industry's retail sales totaled over \$40 billion. With these kind of profits, why are these industries relying on the Federal Government to fund a museum honoring their pastimes? Are we not picking winners and losers when we select only a handful of museums to fund? Is this a fair and equitable process?

More than that, more than being equitable, some say if everybody is given the chance and there's an account to do this, that it's okay, that it's justified, everybody's getting theirs, let me get mine. But I think, particularly for us on this side of the aisle who say that we believe in limited government, economic freedom, individual responsibility, it seems a particularly hard sell.

I'm not making fun of the hobbies of hunting and fishing. As I mentioned, I do a fair amount of both myself. But here I just fail to see a Federal nexus and a Federal role.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment and claim the time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I find it ironic today the

maker of this amendment represents one of the more affluent parts of America, one of the parts of America that wouldn't be there, wouldn't be growing and prospering without billions and billions of Federal investment.

We can start with the 336-mile diversion canal that diverts water from the Colorado River so they can irrigate the desert and make it a city. It seems to me that's a pretty expensive economic development project taking desert and making it grow.

Mesa last year, his home area, \$35 million of their budget is Federal money, and he keeps talking about the process. Well, I think I understand the process, and I'd be glad to debate the process with him any day, anytime, anywhere. I've been in business all my life, retailing. I served in local government 8 years, State government 19 years, Federal Government 11 years, and I understand process.

Rural America is not a part of the process of funds from the Federal Government. This bureaucracy you brag about how they allocate money and how they hand it out as if this was some pure process. Rural communities don't have planning departments. They don't have planning directors. They don't have consultants. They don't hire lobbyists like Mesa and Phoenix and Arizona do. They're fighting for their economic lives.

This little forest county is less than 10,000 people. I think the population went from close to 5,500 to 7,500 because we opened a prison there. It used to be the home of an Evenflo Bottle Company, and those people would like to see a little investment in economic development in that community. It used to be the home of a glass plant. It used to be the home of a cabinet factory. They're all gone.

It is a beautiful area, some of the most beautiful parts of America. It is the best hunting and fishing in America, and tourism is the only tool they have that's working. This Hunting and Fishing Museum is another tool to try to keep hunters and fishermen and travelers and visitors to visit that part of the area.

Another thing, its interactive displays teach young people about hunting and fishing. We have a lot of people today that don't have fathers at home teaching them to hunt and fish. The Hunting and Fishing Museum is going to have classes. They're going to have classrooms. They're going to teach young people the joy of hunting and fishing. I find you take a young man and you teach him to fish, you teach him to hunt, you get him involved in a sport, he's less likely to be in crimes, drugs and on the streets.

It's a part of the fiber of America. There is no urban museum that isn't loaded with Federal dollars to build it.

□ 1515

Rural museums don't have that same pathway. I defy a museum in America that doesn't have Federal funding in it.

Because a little community asks for 50 or 100,000, this is some sort of a crime?

I'm sorry. I'm not going to apologize. I served Forest County as a State House member, a State senator and now a Congressman. I ran a business within 10 miles, and many of these people were customers of mine when I had a supermarket. These are good people fighting for their economic lives trying to build this museum.

The State has allocated \$4 million, but they have to get matching money. This \$100,000 will get them another \$100,000 from the State, because as they raise money, they get money. I gladly debate this museum. It's a good investment for the future for Forest County and for America.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, nobody is suggesting that it is a crime to support this kind of earmark, nor would it be a crime to actually deny funding for it. That's what the process is about.

My complaint, and nobody has suggested either, that there's this pure process at the Federal agency level. It's dysfunctional. We haven't provided the type of oversight that we need to.

The fact that there is an account over there to actually fund economic development projects suggests to me that it's out of control, that that's what we are about, what we should be about. We control the Federal purse strings. It should be in our interest actually to rein in spending over there rather than trying to compete with it and say if they do effect spending on this project or that, whomever has the district, that we shouldn't compete with that here and say, well, we can do one, one-up them with the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. If they had funded another hall of fame, we should say, is it the Federal Government's role to fund these? That's what I am questioning here.

If we can fund teapot museums and mule museums and hunting and fishing museums, what is off limits? What would come here that we could say we are not going to fund that? We could fund a mule museum. How about a donkey museum. Is that out of line? Where do we say enough is enough, and where do we say let's give the taxpayer a break?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. According to the Department of Transportation in 2005, his area received \$580 million for its construction of a \$1.4 billion, that's a pretty big percentage, of a 19.6 mile light rail system serving metropolitan Phoenix.

Why should people from Forest County have to pay that? I should make that argument. We can use it. Mass transit gets huge amounts of money, and Arizona gets lots of that. The largesse goes to the urban areas that have the ability to get it.

One thing about the earmark process, I am not saying it's perfect, but I have



never asked for an earmark that I wouldn't defend publicly in any setting. I am proud today to ask this Congress to give \$100,000 to the Hunting and Fishing Museum in little Forest County, that is trying to rebuild their economic base, enhance their tourism and teach our young people the value of wildlife and fishing and hunting and the beauty of the area. That's a noble issue.

I will gladly support the ability to help that rural county. I ask support of this Congress for this earmark.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Friends of the Cheat Rails to Trails Program.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Transportation—Administrative Provisions—Federal Highway Administration" (and specified for the Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program) is hereby reduced by \$300,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take \$300,000 from the Friends of the Cheat Rails-to-Trails program. The Cheat Trail is one small part of the 13,600 miles of trails built by the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. The program's mission is to create a nationwide network of trails for former rail lines.

The program is a nationwide effort, yet this earmark is aimed directly at one trail in West Virginia. This is not the first time Friends of Cheat have bypassed the Rails-to-Trails program for funding. The House approved a \$300,000 earmark for the Cheat trail just last year. If the trail is in such need of funding, isn't it coming from the funding and the many grants allocated in the Rails-to-Trails program?

This is another problem I have with the contemporary practice of earmarking. If we set up processes at the Federal agency level, and we set up accounts, often when people apply to that account, and apply for a grant and don't get it, then we in Congress will go and give them that project anyway through an earmark.

So if we are telling the Federal agencies, here is a process that you should

go through that is merit based, that is competition based, and then fund those who don't get a contract, what are we saying? If we have a problem with a Federal agency's process or program, then we should amend them.

We should change them. We should call the agency heads before us and say explain why are you doing this, why are you giving money to this organization and not that one, but not to circumvent the process and basically add to it.

The Rails-to-Trails program has over 100,000 members, receives Federal, State and private funding. It was created over 20 years ago. I think that if this organization was to apply to the program, they are quite capable of finding funding. There is funding there.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, in a way, I hardly know where to start here, but I might start with the gentleman's question that he poses time and time again, not only today but in previous days: Is it the Federal Government's role to fund these projects?

He has several different arguments against projects. When projects of a very significant nature are pointed out that are going on in his district, he says, oh, well, in the past they were authorized, appropriated, and he says they have oversight. To what extent, we don't know.

But the point is, they went through a process here in Congress. Article I, section 7 doesn't say what process it should go through. It says that it's the Congress' job to do that. Every Member of this body is looking at their congressional district and thinking about economic developments and what are the needs.

If you are in a transition economy, transitioning from a basic industry, manufacturing economy to a new economy, tourism is a very important part of that new economy, of that vision into the future.

We have seen a lot of projects from industrial areas that fall into that category, whether they are museums, whether they are trails, whether they are any of those kinds of appurtenances, if you will, that contribute to the economic development in the tourism realm.

Well, if the gentleman's question is, is it the government's role, the Federal Government's role, to fund these projects, which he asks over and over again, as the alternative argument against these projects, then it has been answered over and over and over again. It is the Federal Government's role to do it through this body. Constitutionally, it is our responsibility. Article I makes that very clear.

So I just want to point that out and then speak and thank the gentleman

for the opportunity to stand up to speak for Friends of Cheat, because they are doing just that. They are laying the kind of infrastructure that is necessary and crucial to that new economy, and that aspect of our economy in the future of West Virginia is going to be tourism. He has allowed me to speak to that.

Before I speak to it, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership and review of this project. I know his staff has spent hours on it, because my staff has spent hours on the projects that we have approved. But this funding will be used, as the gentleman said, to acquire land and develop a trail in order to create those kinds of infrastructure that are attractive and make usable the bounty that is West Virginia.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me the opportunity to speak in favor of this project. I want to compliment him for the tremendous assets that are going into Arizona. I am extremely impressed; it's an affluent area. His predecessors have worked very hard, as has been pointed out here today.

There is nothing the matter with that, and there is nothing the matter with the process that those projects went through. Nor is there anything the matter with the projects that we are talking about here today have gone through.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Might I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for bringing this amendment, and I appreciate the gentleman from West Virginia coming down to defend this particular language that's here.

I think we need to take a look at this thing from a perspective that's perhaps broader than this particular project, that being that the issues that have been raised here in this Congress will be discussed again and again throughout this appropriations process.

But if the project has merit, it should have merit. It should be able to succeed in its efforts without being specifically identified.

But I think it has a fair amount of weight to drag with it, in that that trail has been there a long time. It could wait awhile longer.

I would submit that the issues that surround the particular district that the gentleman represents should be considered in light of this particular appropriation. The report that came out in the Wall Street Journal that's a little more than a year old, about land that has been purchased along the river that happens to be the same river that this trail runs along, I don't know that it's adjacent, brings a question to mind as to whether or not the gentleman

from West Virginia will be able to follow through on statements reported in the Wall Street Journal that say any claim whatsoever that says these investments are in any way related to my actions as a Member of Congress is categorically false.

I don't deny that statement. I don't actually take issue with that. I would just ask the gentleman if he could suspend his aggressive effort to fund this project until such time as these questions that surround this Cheat River project could be resolved.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, let me just close. Let me say, again, I fail to see the relevance of the number of defense contractors that Arizona has or the amount of Federal money that goes there by contract, by competitive bid or otherwise. How is that relevant to this process?

The truth is, there is something wrong with the process when we have thousands and thousands and thousands of earmarks, when we have 1,500 and just a couple of days to review them before we come here to the floor. There is something wrong with that process.

As I have said before, we can try all we want to conjure up some justification for the contemporary practice of earmarking. But if we think the taxpayers across the country are buying it, we are drinking our own bath water.

We are believing our own press releases if we think that's the case, because they're not. They're not believing it, and they shouldn't. There is no noble pedigree to this kind of earmarking. There really isn't.

So to appropriate money in this fashion is simply not becoming of this Congress. We are better than that. We should have more respect for the institution than that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

□ 1530

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have one final earmark at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall

be available for the Houston Zoo in Houston, Texas.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund" (and specified for the Economic Development Initiative) is hereby reduced by \$300,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chairman.

This amendment would prohibit \$300,000 in Federal funds from being used by the Houston Zoo in Houston, Texas, for an educational broadcast program and would reduce the cost of the bill by a consistent amount.

According to the earmark description in this certification letter, this funding would be used to develop an educational broadcast program to provide interactive distance learning, first to the neighboring institutions at the Texas Medical Center, and ultimately expanding the program to regional school districts.

According to the sponsor's letter, this program would enable children and students to ask questions of and converse with zoo experts in real time, replicating an in-classroom dynamic, but in an exciting and unique manner.

I should say the Houston Zoo is the permanent home of 4,500 animals; the zoo attracts more than 1.5 million visitors a year; general admission is \$10 for an adult, \$5 for a child. In fact, according to the City Navigator, annual revenue for the Houston Zoo in 2006 totaled \$39 billion. In 2006 alone, the Houston Zoo had over \$43 million in net assets and nearly \$20 million in excess revenue. It has a membership base of over 28,000 households. Corporate sponsors include Continental Airlines, Shell Oil, JPMorgan, BMC Software, Conoco-Phillips, FedEx. The list goes on and on.

Again, here, if we are going to start to fund programs at zoos like this, where does it end? Virtually every Member has a zoo or some type of wildlife preserve in their district. Where do we say enough is enough?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of the time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Here again, let me simply say there are a lot of zoos around the country, a lot of zoos that every one of which would like to receive Federal funding. Where do we say enough is enough? Where do we say this zoo is worthy, they have two tigers; this one only has one lion? The tigers get it? I mean, where do we have some kind of equitable process rather than Members

just being able to designate funding of this type? We simply cannot continue to go on in this fashion.

Again, somebody will probably point out Arizona has a lot of defense contractors and gets a lot of Federal money. Again, I fail to see the relevance of that argument here. Let's throw the taxpayers a bone here, if you will, and let's finally say we are going to stop funding for one of these earmarks and actually return to fiscal sanity. We are running between a \$200 billion and \$300 billion deficit this year. Remember, money comes into Washington, we don't have enough to fund the programs, and so we are borrowing money to actually pay for programs like this. We can't continue to do that. I urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what standard the gentleman from Arizona follows, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee, as a guardian of the public Treasury, representing the people of Houston, I have approached all spending requests from the perspective as someone who has a second mortgage on the house and all the credit cards are topped out. My starting answer on all spending requests is "no," and "yes" has to be earned.

I have published all of my appropriations requests on my Web site for many years. I published both my request letters as well as the final result of those requests that the members of the committee have graciously agreed to support because they know that any request coming from me and my office has already been carefully screened. I won't submit requests that haven't already passed my very careful scrutiny.

Again, I approach the request from the perspective of there is not enough money in the Treasury to do it; the starting answer is "no," and "yes" has to be earned; the request has to fall within the functions of the Federal Government, and it has to be something for which there is no other source of revenue.

I am proud to represent the Texas Medical Center. I am proud to represent the Houston Zoo. This \$300,000 will be used by the zoo. They are matching it, providing a 3-1 private match to these dollars that are going to go exclusively into providing live video feeds to critically ill children and children that are dying of cancer who otherwise would have no interaction with the outside world.

The Texas Medical Center is recognized around the world as probably the greatest concentration of medical talent anywhere in the world. God forbid anybody within the sound of my voice comes down with cancer or a dreaded disease; but if they do, there is no better place to find a cure for that than at the Texas Medical Center.

If you are a child with terrible burns, trapped in your room and unable to get out and visit the zoo personally, there

is no television channel in Houston for you to see what goes on at the zoo. The zoo is going to use these dollars to construct dedicated transmission facilities to these dying children, critically ill children in their hospital rooms so they can talk to the feeders, people actually working with the animals, observe the animals around the clock. And, certainly, your mental attitude is a tremendous part of getting well and recovering.

This request was the only one that I submitted on behalf of the Houston Zoo. They submitted a lot of requests to me. In fact, I think the appropriators will find that most of the requests from me will take about one page, because I am very careful and only submit a very few. I am proud of all of them. They are all on my Web site. And I can tell you, this is one that I am very grateful to the chairman Mr. OLVER and to the ranking member Mr. KNOLLENBERG for supporting. They know they don't get many requests from me, and this one certainly is one that is appropriate to help these dying and critically ill children revive their spirits in interacting with and seeing what marvelous work the Houston Zoo is doing, which is, of course, right next door to the Texas Medical Center.

Finally, I want to encourage Members to vote against this amendment based on the merits, but then also because the amendment doesn't save any money. I am one of the most fiscally conservative Members of this House and proud of it. I voted against all of these big new spending programs over the last many years, whether it be the farm bill; I voted against the farm bill, billions of dollars for AIDS in Africa as money we don't have; voted against the No Child Left Behind because that is an intrusion of the 10th amendment sovereignty of the States and money we can't afford to spend; voted against the Medicare prescription drug program. I have voted against most of the big spending programs that have been driven through this House, because I truly believe that I have got a responsibility to my daughter and future generations to try to keep Federal spending at a minimum, diminish the size, power, and cost to the Federal Government.

As Mr. Jefferson, my hero, said, apply core republican principles, with a small "R," keeping most power and responsibility at the local level. If you apply core republican principles, the knot will always untie itself.

So I am always looking for ways to save money. So I would ask Members to vote against this amendment first on the merits; and then, secondly, because unfortunately, once again, Mr. FLAKE's amendment doesn't save any money. He is not reducing the overall 302(a) allocation of the bill. So this is another phantom savings that is not going to result in a savings of one nickel for taxpayers by cutting out the live video feeds to these dying and critically ill children in the medical center.

And I am sick and tired of phony amendments that act like they are going to save money. I have already scrutinized this, along with every other request from my office. I am proud of the work the zoo is doing and the work the medical center is doing. And you can expect me to be out here vigorously defending the work of this committee investing in the sciences.

I thank you, Chairman OBEY. The chairman of my Subcommittee on the Sciences, Mr. MOLLOHAN, is here. Our ranking member, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey. God bless them for the investments they are making into sciences and NASA and medical and scientific research. That is our Nation's insurance policy. I will be out here vigorously defending them against anyone attempting to cut those investments into sciences or NASA or in medical research. That is this Nation's insurance policy.

And I especially resent somebody coming out here and offering a phony amendment that is not going to save one nickel of taxpayer money; because this \$300,000 is not being taken out of the overall spending, it is just going to be spent by bureaucrats.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, again, I do not want to comment on the particular project under question, but, again, I just want to make a point to my friend from Arizona. And I love the State of Arizona. It is a beautiful State. I go there every year to visit some friends. I think it is absolutely wonderful.

But when I came to this Congress, I believe there were four congressional districts in Arizona, four Representatives of Arizona in this House, and there were 10 Representatives from the State of Wisconsin. Now, almost 40 years later, Wisconsin has eight congressional districts, eight Representatives, and Arizona, I believe, has a similar number. That means that Arizona has grown at an incredibly rapid rate, and an awful lot of money from a lot of other States has helped finance that economic growth.

And I return to the Central Arizona Project. I am not expressing a judgment about that project one way or the other, but I do know that it is one of the two or three most expensive earmarks in history. And I would simply suggest that I find it ironic that the gentleman has chosen to go after several projects today in States whose economies are far less prosperous than the gentleman's own State.

I also would question whether or not there is any greater purity in a highway, for instance, being built on the basis of a determination by two or three persons from a given State that knows the area, I don't know why that is any less pure than to have some partisan bureaucrat in the agency decide.

MOMENT OF SILENCE OBSERVED IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks the gentleman from Wisconsin to suspend for one moment.

Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the Committee will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all those present in the Chamber and those visiting us in the gallery please rise for a moment of silence.

The gentleman from Wisconsin may continue.

Mr. OBEY. As I was saying, I don't know why one should assume that a decision to build a highway or any other project, if made by partisan bureaucrats or politically appointed bureaucrats in an agency, I don't know why that is any more pure than a decision being made out in the open by Members of Congress, who I think know their districts as well as any bureaucrat.

So all I would suggest is that while I am certainly not fond of the earmarking process, I am also not fond of the idea that somehow those of us from States not quite as prosperous as the gentleman's need to be embarrassed by the fact that we are asking for a little better deal in terms of Federal money spent in our districts, especially when the gentleman's State is above the national average in terms of the amount of Federal dollars spent in his own State.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to eliminate, consolidate, de-consolidate, co-locate, execute inter-facility reorganization, or plan for the consolidation/deconsolidation, inter-facility reorganization, or co-location of any FAA air traffic control facility or service, with the exception of the reversal of the transfer of the radar functions from the Palm Springs Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) to the Southern California TRACON.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with Representatives POE, FILNER, and BONO to offer an amendment prohibiting the Federal Aviation Administration from eliminating, consolidating, colocating, or planning to consolidate or colocate any terminal radar approach control center, or TRACON.

Our amendment is virtually identical to the amendment that was overwhelmingly approved by the House in a bipartisan fashion by almost 100 votes just last June. Yet, since the House went on record of opposing further consolidation, the FAA has done virtually nothing to address our concerns. Even more, it has accelerated its consolidation efforts while shutting out stakeholders from the process.

Mr. Chairman, the TRACON system guides airplanes within a 50-mile radius of the airport on their takeoffs and final approaches. The FAA has embarked on an ambitious consolidation and colocation plan which will significantly limit our air traffic capacities in the future. I warn that this policy is shortsighted.

It is now rumored that the FAA's current consolidation proposal seeks to eliminate or consolidate nearly 50 TRACONs in over 30 States across the United States.

□ 1545

In some instances, entire States will be left without any approach radar system within their borders. In other instances, consolidation runs the risk of placing undue stress on nearby TRACONs already having to deal with larger airspaces and staffing shortfalls.

In Florida, the FAA is planning to consolidate the TRACONs of Miami International, Ft. Lauderdale International and Palm Beach International airports into one TRACON. Note that all three of these airports are within a Federal high-risk urban area, and smack dab in the heart of Hurricane Alley.

Once this plan is implemented, if a terrorist attack or natural disaster were to strike the Miami TRACON, then all three international airports would lose their approach radar system. Controllers in Jacksonville, an airport more than 350 miles away, will be forced to direct approaching aircraft throughout virtually the entire State.

Realize, Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of whether or not consolidation can technologically be done. It can be done and it is being done. On the contrary, this is a question of should it be done and what risk is Congress willing to run.

Further, in the instances where consensus is possible and consolidation could be appropriate, the FAA is still

refusing to involve stakeholders in the process. To that end, this amendment appropriately exempts the TRACONs of Palm Springs and southern California from the limitation.

Opponents of our amendment likely will argue that the construction of some new control facilities, including one in my district, will be delayed and funds lost if we do not allow consolidation. To them I say, why can't we keep those funds available until all stakeholders can reach a viable solution? Congress does it all the time.

Some point to the FAA authorization bill as the appropriate place to address this issue. And I have great respect for the chairman of that committee with whom I've had a conversation. If that's the case, though, why do we keep throwing money at the problem in this bill? At the very least, we should tie this money to smart policy and a transparent process.

The FAA's TRACON consolidation runs the grave risk of leaving our air traffic system vulnerable during critical times and setting a dangerous precedent for a process that excludes stakeholders from decisions that impact their lives. This is not a risk that Congress should be willing to take.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the major problem, other than lack of funds, related to aviation in this country for the next period of time is the great growth in traffic. We are expecting total traffic to pass 1 billion passengers within the next 10 years. Over the last 10 years it has risen from, gone well above 500 million passengers per year.

Now, this amendment will make the cost of providing facilities and equipment in order to be able to meet that great growth in traffic much higher than it otherwise would be. The modern equipment that is necessary, most of the present towers need to be upgraded, the equipment needs to be upgraded, towers need to be built for the next generation of air traffic control to deal with all of that huge increase in expected traffic. The towers themselves are expensive. The electronic equipment, the facilities, what you call the STARS systems for control, all of these are expensive items, and the expense of the process burgeons if we do not make other kinds of efficiencies.

Now, this amendment would halt all of the modernization of air traffic control facilities, both TRACONs and towers, and the equipment within those facilities. Consolidation has already gone on very successfully in some parts of the country.

The gentleman from Florida has suggested that there are problems in safe-

ty, potential problems in safety. Look, in California they have consolidated to now two TRACONs covering the whole State for the 30-plus million people in California and the roughly 40 commercial air systems, airports that are there. So that kind of consolidation has gone on also in New York, also in Chicago, also in Atlanta, in all of those places, some of the most complicated air traffic systems in the country. The most complicated ones have already been undergoing consolidations, and this proposal would stop that process.

It would cost us \$85 million in savings from planned and designed and in construction consolidations that are already in process. It would cost another \$110 million in funds which would expire, because funds for FAA facilities and equipment goes on a 3-year cycle.

In addition, there would be \$225 million in construction funds that will be placed on hold. It is an extremely costly endeavor, and it is generally wrong-headed, really. We have to have this consolidation because it's critical to the efficient dealing with our movement of air traffic in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Without a great deal of enthusiasm, I oppose the amendment of the gentleman, although I supported it last year. But this year we have in place in our FAA reauthorization bill a process that will cure the problem the gentleman has brought to the House floor.

Frankly, the FAA has not been responsive to the gentleman from Florida. Worse, they have been dismissive. They have not consulted with him or with his airport or with the community that he represents.

In the legislation that the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the subcommittee and I have fashioned with bipartisan support, we have a process in place. Once our authorization bill is enacted, that will require the FAA to consult with communities, with airport authorities, with the Members of Congress on these consolidation proposals and report back to the Congress. We'll get another crack at it. We'll do it in due course and due appropriate process, not the way FAA is proposing to do it, certainly not with a base-closing commission approach that the administration offered to the Congress.

Just today the gentleman from Illinois held a hearing on the wretched conditions in a great many of our air traffic control facilities, which the FAA is ignoring under the guise of modernization of air traffic control system.

Well, come on. That's not happening for another 5 to 10 years. Meanwhile, people have to sit there and suffer through mold and rain and mildew and, in northern Minnesota, in my district in Duluth, snow coming through the windows, or flies in the air traffic control tower in the winter. Come on. That's not taking care of our facilities.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I, too, am opposed to this amendment. A number of planned and paid-for capital improvement projects will be delayed or completely cancelled if this amendment goes through. And I think that the discussion you've heard from the two previous speakers is enough to suggest that, as much as we may want to help the dilemma in the gentleman's Florida area, there is a lot of other land out there across this country that needs to be looked at, too.

I yield to the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. JOHN MICA.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I'm pleased to join Mr. OBERSTAR who chairs our committee, and as the ranking member, and you'll hear from our ranking member on the Aviation Subcommittee, also opposed to this amendment and, I believe, Mr. COSTELLO, who's the Chair of the Aviation Subcommittee, which I previously chaired, is opposed to this amendment. So rarely have we had such bipartisan support in opposing an amendment.

As Mr. OBERSTAR said, too, maybe this may be well-intended to try to deal with some problems we've had in the past, but let me tell you, this amendment can have some very severe consequences. We're talking about closing down the modernization of our air traffic control system.

Here's the headline of today's Washington Times: "FAA Target Airline Delays." I can't come to the floor and not be besieged by Members who haven't been delayed by flights. If you really want to close down our Nation's aviation system, pass this amendment.

We have successfully done these consolidations in the past. We'll do them and modernize and get the latest equipment. However, a moratorium on consolidations through January of 2009 will cause FAA to lose \$110 million of expiring funds this year that are targeted toward modernizing these facilities, and nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in construction costs will be placed on hold for projects currently in process across the country. This would be a disaster.

Many of the airports affected are planning to make improvements, and all of this attempt to get our aviation industry moving and air traffic moving and modernization of the system will come to a grinding halt. May be well-intended, may try to solve a problem that the gentleman from Florida has experienced, but this is not the solution.

I urge opposition.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield now to the gentleman on the Transportation and In-

frastructure Committee, Mr. PETRI from Wisconsin.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues on the committee who have studied this matter in opposing the amendment before us.

Just this morning the Aviation Subcommittee conducted a hearing on our aging air traffic control facilities, some of which are in very, very bad condition, and this amendment would move us in the wrong direction rather than the right direction. The impact of the amendment would be, according to the FAA, that it would lose some \$110 million in funds that have been programmed to modernize the facilities that it needs to maintain to keep our system moving. And this will expire if the amendment is adopted.

The average age of FAA towers is some 27 years and in route centers are 43 years. They need to spend some \$30 billion over the next few years to modernize the facilities and maintain them.

And I realize that it's a well-meaning amendment, but it would set us back and delay the efficiency and mobility of our population, and could even result in some increase in risk in the system.

For those reasons, I would urge rejection of the amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Would the Chair advise how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 30 seconds.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that each side be given an additional 2 minutes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to Mr. POE, my colleague from Texas.

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly a proponent of this amendment. I represent southeast Texas. We have a TRACON at Houston Intercontinental Airport. We have one in Beaumont, 90 miles away. And I am not convinced that the consolidation of these two TRACONs in Houston is a good idea for safety.

I'm also concerned about the fact that we have more and more planes in the air, but yet the FAA wants to have fewer and fewer facilities in the United States to control that aviation.

I'm also concerned, as the gentleman from Florida is, about security. Down in southeast Texas, what I represent, I represent the number one refinery in the United States, the number two refinery in the United States. Twenty-two percent of the Nation's aviation fuel is produced in my area.

□ 1600

And if there was some tragic event, some terrorist attack on Houston and the Intercontinental Airport, who

would be controlling the skies? Some TRACON unit in Oklahoma City and New Mexico? I think not. I think it is good that we have two TRACONs in the area.

And, lastly, I am not convinced that this would save any money. Just as we went through with the BRAC military base closures, we are finding that that did not save the taxpayers any money, especially with Ellington Field in Houston.

So for all those reasons I think this is a wise amendment for safety and security, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, going forward, my colleagues argue that we would lose \$110 million that expires at the end of this year for FAA. I remind my colleagues that this is the United States Congress, and I have been here when we have extended the kinds of funds that would be made allocable to agencies by time. If we wanted to, the \$110 million that has been discussed could be extended for 2 or 3 years, and FAA could be delayed in that particular undertaking with reference to so-called modernization.

What they did in this particular measure, after we passed the measure last year, FAA then accelerated their process rather than sitting down and talking with the stakeholders such as the Members of Congress or pilots or air traffic controllers or airport operators or aviation operators and the general public; absolutely no discussion, and then put forward the measures that have come out now. That is the primary reason that I am on the floor. Sixteen thousand controllers and engineers believe this to be the case.

For the RECORD I will include a letter from the National Air Traffic Controllers Association.

NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC  
CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO,  
Washington, DC, July 23, 2007.

VOTE YES ON THE HASTINGS-POE-FILNER-BONO  
AMENDMENT TO THUD APPROPRIATIONS

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As the President of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA), representing over 16,000 controllers, engineers, architects, nurses and aviation safety professionals, I urge you to vote yes on the Hastings-Poe-Filner-Bono amendment to H.R. 3074, the FY08 Transportation Appropriations Act. Representative Alcee Hastings offered a very similar amendment to last year's TTHUD bill to prevent the FAA from consolidating Terminal Approach Control (TRACON) facilities, and it passed with 261 bipartisan votes.

In the past, NATCA and the FAA have worked in tandem to identify air traffic control facility consolidations that could potentially make sense and to ensure that the process involves the important input from vital stakeholders. Unfortunately, the FAA is no longer taking into consideration the legitimate concerns of stakeholders such as Members of Congress, pilots, air traffic controllers, airport operators, aviation operators, and the general public.

NATCA believes that the FAA must consider air traffic control facility consolidations/colocations using a transparent process

because the Agency has an obligation to involve stakeholders in any Agency effort that could affect the safety and efficiency of the airspace. A full risk-assessment, including the Homeland Security implications of placing all of our radar functions in one location, must be conducted and made open to public scrutiny.

A moratorium on consolidations is necessary to provide the opportunity for Congress to evaluate the specific operational need for proposed consolidations and prevent the Agency from moving ahead with flawed consolidation plans without a defined policy.

We hope that you will support the efforts of our nation's professional air traffic control workforce in keeping our National Airspace System the safest in the world by supporting this amendment. Vote yes on Hastings-Poe-Filner-Bono.

Sincerely,

PATRICK FORREY,  
*President.*

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Hastings amendment, joining the chairman of the full committee, Chairman OBERSTAR; the ranking member Mr. MICA; and Mr. PETRI.

Mr. HASTINGS is exactly right. The FAA has done a very poor job of communicating with Members of Congress and stakeholders on its plans to consolidate and relocate facilities, but halting the process at this stage is not the answer.

Instead, what we need is an open, continuous, and defined process, and that is exactly what we have in the reauthorization bill that the Transportation Committee passed just a few weeks ago. It allows affected stakeholders to work together with the FAA to develop criteria and make recommendations that will be submitted to the Congress and published in the Federal Register for proper review and oversight. Any objections or changes made to the recommendations must again be submitted to the Congress. Congress does not relinquish its role, but, instead, can provide thorough review, oversight, and input.

Let me say that preventing consolidation and relocation is not the answer. We just held a hearing this morning, the Aviation Subcommittee, in which we discussed the FAA's aging traffic control facilities. Many of these facilities are 40 years old or older, and they are exceeding their useful life expectancy in not meeting current operational requirements. This has resulted in the GAO's giving many of the facilities a score of fair to poor.

We must ensure that the FAA make the investments needed to maintain the current existing infrastructure, including in some cases consolidation and relocation, to ensure that the current system can continue to operate in a safe and reliable way. I believe the best course of action is to address this issue through the reauthorization bill, and that is exactly what we have done in passing the bill out of committee.

As a result, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Hastings amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that the gentleman from Florida has made the point that the House passed last year legislation doing this. That was never acted upon and was not included in the CR, the final CR for the 2007 budget. That was adopted in the House version of the bill, but it was not carried through to the CR. So there is no precedent of merit there.

Secondly, the crux of our problem is that we have a huge growth of air traffic that is expected within a 20-year period. From 1995 to the year 2015, we will have gone from half a billion passengers to a billion passengers, and that is in the commercial traffic, plus all of the increase in general aviation. We cannot sit with our head in the sand and not modernize all these facilities, the towers, the facilities, the equipment, the control systems that are necessary to deal with that increase in traffic, and that has to be done. It has already been done in some of our major parts of the country.

The gentleman from Texas has concerns about Texas. The authorizing language which the T&I Committee has reported out includes a system to look at those cases to review and to set up a system for reviewing how those systems will be set up in additional places as the consolidation of TRACONs and the modernization of these facilities and the reequipment of these facilities must go forward.

So I think that that part of it is a red herring, truly. In the case of Chicago and New York and Philadelphia and Washington and California, our heaviest traffic locations in the country, and Atlanta besides, we already have these consolidations in place. And in the case of California, 40-some-odd airports and their tower facilities have been included now in 2 TRACONs where there used to be 8 or more TRACONs in the State of California.

So the number of TRACONs is going to come down. It must come down, and we must get on with this modernization of the facilities and equipment that otherwise would always be very costly. It must be done.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida, though I don't think I have much time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Just to say, Mr. Chairman, you know there is another component to all of this, and that is that the 16,000 air traffic controllers and the people that work in these modern facilities are overburdened, and I just for the life of me do not understand how we don't understand the dynamics of their work.

And I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. OLVER. They will be much less burdened if they have new facilities and new equipment, equipment that is modern and that can manage to handle that traffic in a much more efficient manner.

I hope that the amendment will not be adopted.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration to implement its preferred alternative of the New York/New Jersey/Philadelphia Airspace Redesign project.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment on my own behalf as well as Congressman GARRETT from New Jersey, my colleague; and Congressman CHRISTOPHER SHAYS from Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey, SCOTT GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am pleased to come to the floor today with my colleague from New Jersey, Morristown, and also my other colleague here as well from Connecticut, CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, as we propose an amendment that will ask the FAA to basically more closely consider how their proposed airspace redesign plan will impact upon the quality of life of the residents of the State of New Jersey, from Connecticut, and also from the State of New York as well.

Now, we all recognize that the skies over our area are more crowded than ever before, and air travel is, obviously, a worthy goal. But the FAA must make noise and air pollution a top consideration whenever they work to redesign their airspace.



Residents of the communities across the five States are facing a threat now to the quiet of their communities and also to the value of their homes as well. The residents of my area, the Fifth District of New Jersey, are especially concerned about this. Just recently we held what you call a town meeting of sorts, and nearly 1,500 people came out to the public hearing up in Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, and that was just about a month ago. And they came out to voice their concerns directly to the FAA.

The FAA received comments from all present, but wouldn't it have been a lot better if the FAA had taken those comments before they drafted their preferred alternative? The citizens who came to that meeting left with a deep concern that the FAA just is not listening. So this amendment is really here to help force the FAA to listen to those people in the area.

So as noise in these communities increases, there is a very real possibility that the values of their homes are going to decrease. Residents are concerned their communities are going to be drastically affected by the fact that the FAA is simply trying to save 2, 3, 4, 5 minutes from the travelers' air time.

So, in conclusion, we are simply asking now through this amendment that the FAA reconsider their preferred alternative with an eye towards protecting the communities and considering that at the same time that they consider the air travelers as well.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, this and the previous amendment go together. Together, if these two amendments pass, our air traffic control system will be set back years in the process from which they have been going forward in trying to modernize both the air traffic design and the TRACON facilities to be used.

The FAA has spent more than \$50 million on airspace redesign in the New York, Philadelphia, New Jersey, western Connecticut area already. They have posted hundreds of outreach meetings to understand the needs and concerns. In addition, the design has undergone independent analysis by the inspector general throughout the process, and the FAA has adopted each of the IG's recommendations.

Now, what are the benefits, what are the purposes of the airspace redesign? Well, number one, we have got this huge expected increase in traffic that I have already spoken to twice.

Secondly, the air traffic region that is being described here, and this amendment only affects that region, not the whole country, only that region, but that air traffic system, that airspace system, is the system where the greatest delays, the greatest delays, are happening as we speak.

The redesign of the airspace would allow for a major reduction in delays, first of all. By so doing, there would be less noise. They would be able to fly at higher altitudes, and use a gradual glide pattern in rather than stepwise glide patterns in, and use the whole airspace so that the net reduction of people who are affected by noise, by the levels of noise, is very large.

In addition to that, environmentally if you are not flying around for long periods of time in the airspace and under delay and in holding patterns and sitting on the tarmac with the engines going, then you are saving a lot of fuel.

□ 1615

There will be much less fuel burned, therefore, much better air quality control in the process.

All of these taken together, along with the fact that if you've got delays in that major area where so much traffic occurs, then there are backups with delays all over the country. So the air space design issue is a critical issue in totality for our modernization of our traffic control.

So, I oppose the amendment, and I hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia metropolitan area has the most complex air space in the United States; that means, the most complex air space in the world. Four of the Nation's five airports reporting the worst on-time performance are Newark, LaGuardia, JFK and Philadelphia. Holding time is five times greater than any place in the country.

The percentage of flights that arrive in Newark over an hour late is 15 percent of all the flights. Seventy-five percent of the Nation's domestic and international flights are affected by delays and inefficiencies in the New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia air space, no matter where they're going.

You have international flights arriving from the transatlantic corridor. You have flights arriving from Canada, flights arriving from South America, flights arriving transcontinental from the United States on the east coast merging into this area. Sure, there are awful noise impacts upon residents, but the redesign will save noise to some 619,000 people, shifting it elsewhere, shifting it away from other people. FAA has held over 120 public meetings since they began the process of the air space redesign. This will save 20 percent of delays and 12 million minutes a year. This is important to the Nation, not just to this region.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I, too, oppose the amendment. I agree that we need

to do something with the problems that are out there. We have to strike a balance between our neighborhoods and our close-in airports. And I know that Mr. GARRETT spoke about 1,500 people showing up for a hearing and/or town hall hearing, some kind. That's a lot of people, so there is a lot of grief and upset out there. But the traffic delays of the New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania airports, as has been pointed out by Mr. OBERSTAR, are the worst in history, and I think it's less than 50 percent of the flights were on time. The FAA does need to act.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, Mr. MICA from Florida, a member of the T&I Committee.

Mr. MICA. It is, again, rare that we have the chairmen on both sides of the aisle, the appropriation and authorizing committee, all uniformly in opposition to an amendment. But let me tell you, if you want to close down air traffic in the United States indefinitely in the Northeast, adopt this amendment.

Now, this isn't something that we just cooked up, that we're going to redesign the air space in the Northeast corridor. We started on this in 1998. We haven't redesigned the air corridor in the northeast United States since 1988. Imagine not expanding the roads or the transportation system in the Northeast since 1998 and the congestion you would have, and that's exactly what we've got.

Now, I've been to the districts. I've been to Mr. GARRETT's district, Mr. FOSSELLA's district. I've been to Mr. SHAYS' district. And I continue to work with Members, when I chaired the Aviation Subcommittee, and now as ranking member, and we will work with them, but we have got to redesign the air space. Imagine having no expansion highways. Now, planes are no different than highways; they run in corridors. But we haven't changed it in the Northeast corridor since 1988. We have been working on this redesign since 1998, some 10 years. We have got to make these changes and move forward with them.

And we need to listen to the people. We need to make certain that we don't harm their environment, their noise levels, and take into consideration as many of the points that have been raised. But I urge you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague for yielding.

First of all, let me say that there is no one in this body who pays more attention and is more hardworking in defending the interests of his constituents than Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, the author of this amendment. But the fact of

the matter is that it's not in the national interest to stop this study in its track. They're not doing it just because they want to. They're doing it because the Nation has grown. The system is at capacity. It needs to be redesigned to accommodate the movement of people by air through this New York region. If we don't do it, they will have to go by train, and that's almost at capacity. And the roads are congested. It will slow down our economy. It will impact and affect the growth of the whole region if this can't go forward.

So, I would urge people to defeat the amendment. We will work with the Member from New Jersey and others to make sure they're sensitive to local noise concerns, but this is not the way to do it.

I urge rejection of the amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

For well over 15 years, I've been an advocate of reducing aircraft noise over northern New Jersey. I have attended dozens of public hearings, had meetings with FAA officials, responded to thousands of letters from constituents whose lives have been negatively affected by the existing air traffic patterns and related noise. I have been more than a proponent of a design of air space over New York and New Jersey metropolitan area, the first such redesign conducted by the FAA, but I have actually been working on funding for this design plan.

And let me say, I respect Mr. OBERSTAR. I respect all of the big guns that are out against this amendment. But the issue is, and Mr. OBERSTAR mentioned it, is that the FAA has always been dismissive of aircraft noise concerns. We're not trying to say that we shouldn't be concerned about airline safety and too much congestion, and we don't want to do damage to our airline industry, but for those in the flight patterns now, what they propose negatively affects our constituents in northern New Jersey.

Quite honestly, the FAA, if you will pardon the expression, has been blowing us off for a long time. They've been dismissive. So this amendment is all about sending a wake-up call to Administrator Blakely.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in opposition to the amendment.

As Mr. MICA said, the last comprehensive change to the air space Northeast corridor occurred in 1987 and 1988. Since that time, the traffic has grown significantly. Delays and inefficiencies in the New York-New Jersey-

Philadelphia metropolitan area must be addressed as they have reached an all-time high.

Eighty-six percent of the delays caused by the New York center were due to the air space volume. Let me repeat that. Eighty-six percent of the delays caused by the New York center were due to air space volume.

In the first quarter of 2007, the five airports with the worst on-time performance were Newark, LaGuardia, O'Hare, JFK and Philadelphia. Four of the five airports are part of the air space redesign. The New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia air space will handle 15 to 20 percent of all of the air traffic in the Nation by 2011.

The FAA has a specific process in place that it must follow in implementing the air space redesign. Over the course of the project, the FAA has held over 120 meetings to allow stakeholder input, many of which were not required by law. My colleagues, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SESTAK and I have asked the GAO to look into the air space redesign to make sure that the FAA has followed the law in implementing this redesign. However, I do not believe that we should be halting the project at this time. It is too critical to our system not to go forward.

Congress should not pick winners and losers in the air space redesign debate. This amendment is asking us to do just that. And for that reason, I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in strong opposition to this amendment, with much due respect to my friend and colleague from New Jersey.

And in large part it has been echoed, but let me repeat it. If anybody who was sitting on a runway, whether you are across this country, especially in LaGuardia or Kennedy, and in particular, Newark Airport, you would be stampeding this House to ensure that this redesign go through. The reason being, as has been detailed extensively, and who knows it better than the riding public, is that congestion is at all all-time high and only will get worse unless this plan is put in place.

The second, and perhaps I would, quote, in clean hands talk with respect to air noise with the people of Staten Island, that practically every plane that takes off to the south goes over Staten Island. So I can appreciate those who don't want more planes going over because the people in Staten Island suffer every day.

The preferred alternative in the plan will reduce traffic from Newark Airport from about 20 minutes to 12 minutes; will reduce air noise, as I said, over Staten Island; will reduce costs to airlines by \$248 million by 2011; and a 1999 study showed that by 2010, we would hurt the U.S. economy by about another \$4 billion, and the preferred alternative outlined in the plan could

save our economy as much as 7 to 9 billion.

It is important and imperative that this plan go through. The riding public deserves it. Those sitting on runways now deserve it. Those waiting to get to Newark or any other airport deserve it. And I would just urge a speedy and urgent opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Before yielding to my colleague from Connecticut, this appropriations bill relating to the FAA has always carried language directing the FAA to deal with the issue of air noise. It has been repeatedly ignored.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Mr. SHAYS of Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Frelinghuysen-Shays-Garrett amendment should be adopted. The big guns, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee involved in transportation and, the ranking member and the chairman of the full Transportation Committee, and the ranking member are all against it. And what they're doing is sending a message once again to the FAA that they can continue to be arrogant, that they can continue to ignore the public, that they can continue to do whatever they want as it relates clearly to safety and efficiency, but they don't have to care about anything else. They don't have to care about quality of life. They don't have to listen to anybody about quality of life, particularly as it relates to impact of noise. They can ignore us as they have continued to ignore us throughout the years.

So now what you will have in LaGuardia is planes taking off twice as often. They will veer to the left, then they will veer to the right. They will veer to the left, they will veer to the right. They won't run these planes over Long Island Sound. They will run them right over individual homes. They don't care. They don't listen. They don't give us an opportunity to speak.

I have constituents who have attended hearings, but are told, Listen to us. You can't testify.

If we want the FAA to come and allow testimony, they say we'll come to Danbury (where the planes are at 8,000 feet), but we won't come in to Stamford where they're 4,000 feet. They don't want anyone to know what they're doing. We need to pay attention to them. We need to give some authority to those in the community who have a different view . . . to those who are concerned about noise and quality of life.

I rise today in support of the [Frelinghuysen/Shays/Garrett] amendment that would prohibit funding for the Federal Aviation Administration to implement its New York/New Jersey/Philadelphia Airspace Redesign for one year until FAA Reauthorization is complete.

First, let me say I understand the FAA's desire to improve efficiency at LaGuardia, Newark, Teterboro, Philadelphia and JFK. I represent a great number of business travelers who are frustrated by long delays at many of these airports.

With that being said, however, I strongly oppose the FAA's Integrated Airspace Alternative that would route more air traffic over residential neighborhoods. Over the past few months, the FAA has zeroed in on this proposal as its preferred alternative.

Throughout this time, I have shared my concerns and the concerns of my constituents with the FAA, particularly the fact that the plan brings more planes into the region at the expense of the region's quality of life.

I am particularly disappointed the FAA has not implemented any noise mitigation strategies in the district I represent, or in many districts throughout the Northeast, despite the wide swath of land over the Fourth District that will be adversely impacted by planes flying as low as 4,000 feet.

Even though there is no mandate to consider quality of life issues, the FAA simply must not ignore the hugely negative impacts of air noise in this process.

I believe that if the FAA had to consider the quality of life impacts of the Integrated Airspace Alternative, it would never have concluded that airspace redesign was the appropriate first attempt at relieving air traffic congestion.

It seems to me there are other solutions that should be considered before implementing such a radical alternative that negatively affects so many thousands of residents throughout the Northeast.

In my judgment, a one year delay to this plan is appropriate. We are working to reauthorize the FAA this year. I am hopeful we can give the FAA authority to implement other solutions in the authorization process, and protect precious quality-of-life. I urge adoption of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

At the end of the bill before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to establish or implement a cross-border motor carrier demonstration or pilot project or program to allow Mexico-domiciled motor carriers to operate beyond the commercial zones on the United States-Mexico border.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. In May, the Appropriations Committee included language in the FY07 supplemental to impose requirements on the Department of Transportation before they open the U.S. border to Mexican trucks, giving them free range across the United States of America. This language by the committee was the first step in ensuring that the Department of Transportation considered safety and security ramifications before allowing cross-border traffic and before rushing into a pilot. And unfortunately, the Bush administration immediately declared that they were in compliance with the law, making no changes in their program.

□ 1630

This is a paper-based program. They have not inspected physically one Mexican truck. They have not interviewed one Mexican driver. In Mexico, they have no system of drug testing, unlike the United States of America, and no certified drug-testing laboratories, unlike the United States of America. They have no hours of service in Mexico. Mexican drivers are frequently required to drive as long as 72 hours. They take drugs to do it. They freely admit that in the Mexican press.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would be perfectly happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman in this amendment to strike the funds for this project on the basis that this poses a security risk for our country.

We have absolutely no view of the background of the hundreds and thousands of truckers who will be coming in behind the wheels of these vehicles now with no offload requirement. In the areas of narcotics transportation and potentially terrorist transportation, this is an exposure for the United States.

I support the gentleman strongly.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to support Congressman DEFAZIO's amendment and appreciate the chairman's willingness to consider it. Coming from the Midwestern part of the country, we literally have had Mexican trucks end up in our region, how, we don't know, where the driver was actually moving the steering wheel with a vise grip. Now, how does that get to the State of Ohio all the way from the border with Mexico? Something is really broken in the system already. We should not expand anything. We should fix the problem that we have today.

Let me tell you, the sheriffs in Ohio along the turnpike and all of our surface roads are busy dealing with traffic that shouldn't be there in the first place. A lot of those vehicles are carrying illegal narcotics into our region. That border is a sieve. We ought to take care of it.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment and commend him for offering it here today.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am in strong, strong support of this. The House has overwhelmingly voted 411-3 to pass this amendment. To be honest, I think it is just an egregious grab of power by the administration to take the will of the American people and the will of this Congress and completely disregard it.

There are not systems or laboratories in place to test for drugs. There isn't documentation in order to make sure that we have inspected our trucks, that we have the training, and that there is drug testing. It is just a complete farce to be told that these safety requirements are going to be met.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I, as well as the people of the Second District of Kansas, are strongly urging the President to stop this. I certainly support this bill, which will stop the funding and stop this pilot program.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I will be very, very brief.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that we are all in agreement here. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) is. I am. That should be the end of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the chair and the ranking member for their support on this. This will be a tremendous step toward protecting the American traveling public. It will move us away from a system of faith-based regulation and protection to one based on the rule of law and regulations.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, has worked tirelessly on the issue of cross-border trucking in this Congress and I commend his determination in probing the details of the Administration's plans to open the U.S.-Mexico border to truck traffic.

While I strongly support this amendment, I am at the same time extremely disappointed that Congress must take yet another step to compel the Administration to do the right thing and protect the safety of the American people.

Members of Congress face growing frustration with the Administration's clear desire to

open the U.S.-Mexico border at any cost, with minimal regard for the safety of the traveling public, and little attention to the concerns raised by the House and Senate. Today's amendment is the culmination of a mounting effort to ensure safety and to hold the U.S. Department of Transportation ("DOT") accountable as the Department reveals its plans for opening our nation's southern border.

On February 23, 2007, Secretary of Transportation Peters announced the start of a one-year pilot program to grant 100 Mexico-domiciled trucking companies unrestricted access to U.S. roads, beyond the commercial zones at the U.S.-Mexico border. DOT has acknowledged that this pilot program is the first step to full border opening. This announcement had generated a groundswell of opposition.

Since February, Congress has tried to shed some light on this pilot program. On March 13, 2007, the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit held an oversight hearing on the pilot program. Chairman DeFazio and I have asked the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation to review the proposed pilot program for compliance with all applicable motor carrier safety and hazardous materials laws and regulations.

On March 29, 2007, Representative BOYDA introduced H.R. 1773, the Safe American Roads Act of 2007, of which I am a proud sponsor. This legislation limits the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to unilaterally open the United States-Mexico border to truck and bus traffic under the ruse of a hasty pilot program. Instead the bill provides the U.S. with an opportunity to test, evaluate, and learn from the impacts of allowing Mexico-domiciled trucks on our highways, but only once a strict set of prerequisites are met and only under a specific set of conditions.

At the beginning of May, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered the bill reported to the House by a vote of 66-0. The House passed the bill on May 15, 2007, by an overwhelming vote of 411-3.

The message to Secretary Peters has been clear: proceed with caution and do not open the border to Mexico-domiciled trucks until sufficient checks are in place to ensure that they meet U.S. motor carrier safety laws. Yet, DOT opposes the safeguards included in H.R. 1773. It continues to charge ahead, and intends to start the pilot program as early as next month.

The agency seems to have little regard for what findings or shortcomings may come to light in the reviews required to date by Congress. DOT has been unwilling to make changes to its plans to bring the proposed pilot program in line with the strict criteria strongly supported by the House. As a result, we must take this action today to bring this program to a standstill.

I continue to question whether DOT is truly ready to open the border, and whether adequate systems are in place to make sure Mexican carriers meet our strict federal safety requirements. It is well-established that Mexican law does not require many fundamental elements of highway safety that are required for U.S. vehicles and drivers, including hours-of-service restrictions, drug and alcohol testing, and commercial driver's licensing requirements. Data collection issues and tracking violations of Mexican drivers while operating in the U.S. also remains a challenge.

The United States is bound to live up to its commitments under the North American Free

Trade Agreement ("NAFTA"). However, nothing in NAFTA suggests that we must allow Mexico-domiciled motor carriers to operate throughout the U.S. if they pose a safety hazard to our citizens.

Launching a cross-border pilot program represents a major shift in transportation policy. It is the responsibility of DOT to ensure that any program that allows trucks from Mexico to enter the United States must be conducted with the safety of the American people as the highest priority. We must not forget this in a rush to open the border.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. GARY G. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to take any action to issue a final rule or notice based on, or otherwise implement, all or any part of the proposed rule of the Department of Housing and Urban Development published on Friday, May 11, 2007, on page 27048 of volume 72 of the Federal Register (Docket No. FR-5087-P-01), relating to standards for mortgagor's investment in mortgaged property.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to prevent HUD from implementing a new rule that will effectively close homeownership opportunity to many American families.

In today's housing market, one of the primary barriers to achieving the dream of homeownership is the lack of accumulated wealth and disposable income. Fortunately, some nonprofit organizations have developed programs to provide down payments to qualifying families. Such programs empower individuals and families who lack the necessary funds for down payment and other related costs, but can afford the monthly mortgage payment to become homeowners.

These down payment assistance programs have proven successful in expanding ownership opportunity to low- and moderate-income families. In the past, HUD has permitted the use of these programs in conjunction with FHA-insured loans. Recently, however, HUD issued a proposed rule that would effectively eliminate seller-funded down payment assistance programs.

I am very concerned about the impact of this proposed rule on homeownership in this country. Rather than going too far, I believe we should develop reasonable and fair criteria by which these programs can continue to operate while also protecting the FHA insurance fund. If there are legitimate problems that have been identified by HUD, then let's work together to fix the problems.

The amendment I offer today with Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee Chairman WATERS and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas would prohibit funds from being used to implement this proposed rule. It would give Congress time to work with HUD to preserve down payment assistance programs while imposing strong regulations and oversight. This amendment will allow us to put the control in place that will weed out the bad actors, while still allowing those who help millions become homeowners to continue their good work.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to preserve homeownership opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would overturn HUD's urgent attempt to halt these scam practices by the so-called nonprofits that operate under the veil of helping people get mortgages.

Under the guidance of the Inspector General, and in coordination with the Treasury Department, HUD is moving to crack down on so-called nonprofits that offer to pay the down payment so that families can purchase a home. This amendment would overturn that effort and cost the taxpayers some millions of dollars in defaulted loans.

While there may be honest nonprofits, and I am sure there are, that genuinely want to help increase homeownership, this program does have many problems.

First, the default rate for mortgages in which the down payment is paid for by nonprofits is three times the national average. That is the default rate. This has cost millions and is a source of instability to the fund, and, according to HUD, is a major reason that the FHA fund is rapidly heading to a deficit situation.

Second, there is no free lunch. The mortgages are simply turned upside down with the down payment added to the price of the home. They are not free to the homeowner. Further, expensive fees are often added to the costs of the mortgage by nonprofits.

The Treasury Department is moving quickly to revoke the nonprofit status

of many of these organizations, but HUD needs to act now and needs to get this rule out as final.

I oppose any attempt to delay the rule and oppose this amendment. I think that if the Federal Government is so concerned about how a program is operating that it feels compelled to draft a regulation, I think we should carefully review the situation before we rush to overturn that effort. Frankly, we have not done that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am actually in support of this amendment. I think the authorizers have been hard at work at reforming the FHA program, and I support their efforts to resolve this issue.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Miller-Waters-Green amendment to H.R. 3074. On June 22, 2007, the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, which I chair, held a hearing on homeowner down payment assistance programs. That hearing provided a window into down payment assistance programs that I had not seen before.

The hearing was prompted by the issuance of the HUD proposed rule on May 11, 2007, to terminate down payment assistance programs. I applaud HUD for extending the comment period for the proposed rule, but that is not enough.

Down payment assistance provided by charitable organizations to low- and moderate-income individuals and families to purchase homes has been a mainstay of HUD and FHA since 1999. In fact, we heard testimony that 30 to 40 percent of FHA loans used some type of down payment assistance.

What was even more astonishing was that HUD proposed a similar rule in 1999, only to have never finalized it. Indeed, HUD's failure to finalize a rule gave de facto approval for the continuation of many down payment assistance programs.

Down payment assistance is often used in conjunction with HUD's mortgage insurance under the 203(b) program administered by FHA. Down payment assistance programs have helped nearly 1 million low- and moderate-income persons become homeowners, providing an instant source of equity for them. Homeownership would be out of reach to thousands of homeowners without down payment assistance programs.

Unfortunately, HUD's issuance of the proposed rule on May 11, 2007, would eliminate the use of down payment assistance programs. FHA opposes the use of direct or indirect funding provided from the sale of property, and that is fine. But an across-the-board re-

jection of all down payment assistance programs without further review, analysis or clarification from HUD is unacceptable.

Down payment assistance programs do not need to be the scapegoat for, as what one HUD called it, the "looming shortfall" in HUD's fiscal year 2008 budget. I believe if HUD is left to its own devices, this is exactly what will happen to down payment assistance programs.

I support down payment assistance programs meeting Federal requirements. Therefore, I ask that you join Gary Miller, Al Green and me in supporting the amendment to prohibit HUD from implementing the proposed rule with any funds from this bill.

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment because it is a good amendment, and HUD's language is bad language.

Mr. Chairman, since 1997, this program has assisted literally nearly 1 million families with down payment assistance. In my district alone, it has helped more than 600 families. This program is a privately funded down payment assistance program. I think that is important for us to highlight, a privately funded down payment assistance program.

Yes, there is some concern with reference to the appraisals, but that can be amended and fixed by way of a program similar to what the VA has. The VA has a blind pool appraisal process. With a blind pool appraisal process, you can get the appraisals that are fair market value, and you will save the program that has helped so many families.

This program is viable. It helps community development. It is meaningful. It helps needy buyers. It is workable. It can work through HUD, and it is achievable without this language. I suggest that my colleagues vote for it. Let's save this program. Let's vote for this amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I respect my good friend's argument on behalf of Treasury and HUD; however, I want to remind my colleagues that it has been just a few years ago that Treasury and HUD came to us and asked us to implement the American Dream Down Payment Assistance Act, which means the Federal Government will give individuals the down payment and closing cost money necessary to be able to own a home that otherwise they would never be able to own a home where they can make the payment.

The argument made to us is the private sector is doing it. We can implement upon what the private sector is doing, and with the government's participation, we can put even more people into homes.

□ 1645

Now, if we have a problem as some say with appraisals that are not being factual enough, then let's implement the same underwriting criteria that FHA will use on zero downpayment and FHA uses on the American Dream Downpayment Act. If you can come up with a reasonable appraisal to give Federal dollars to somebody to buy a home, why can you not come up with the same criteria for a reasonable appraisal to help the private sector put people into homes?

Mr. GREEN made a very good point. We put a million people into homes with the Downpayment Assistance Program provided by the private sector, and the argument made in committee was 15 percent of these loans that were made are troubled. Now, that does not mean that 15 percent are being foreclosed upon. That means 15 percent might have missed a payment at one point in time or had some other problem at some other point in time.

But on the other side, you have 850,000 people, families who own a home today, who built up equity they would not have otherwise have had renting a home and now have a home that had it not been for the private sector would have been renting an apartment or be in section 8 or in government housing.

If that 15 percent relates to 4 or 5 percent in foreclosures, and if that 4 or 5 percent has something to do with underwriting standards being used that do not meet the criteria they should meet, or if appraisals are being implemented that do not meet the criteria they should meet, let's get together as a Congress first in committee, let's deal with the problems and rewrite the law and bring it before this House and debate it, and let's make sure that the bad apples and those that my friend said are practicing scam practices are eliminated.

But to think that we are going to eliminate the possibility in the next 4 or 5 years for a million families to own a home, or have them come to the Federal Government and ask for a downpayment when they could also go to the private sector and ask for a downpayment, it seems some way disingenuous and unrealistic for us to do that. If there is a problem, let's fix it. If FHA can offer a zero downpayment loan under given underwriting criteria, and we use the same underwriting criteria for a downpayment assistance loan and the person owes \$200,000 with zero downpayment and \$194,000 with the downpayment assistance, they are better off with the program.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22 Offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Edmunds Center for the Arts, City of Edmunds (WA).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of earmarks in this bill that are somewhat similar to this one. I will be the first to admit I don't know all that much about the Edmonds Center for the Arts. But as I follow these typical earmark debates, I know that soon there will be a Member to come to the floor to tell me he knows his district better than I do. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point.

He will also tell me that this body has the authority to provide for this earmark. Mr. Chairman, I once again concede the point.

I am sure they will come down here and say good things can be done with the money. Mr. Chairman, once again, I will concede the point.

They will also tell us well, it is a very small portion of the Federal budget. Mr. Chairman, I will concede the point.

But here is what I will not concede: the money is a very small portion of the Federal budget. But I fear again that earmarks in general, and perhaps this category in specific, become a larger portion of the culture of spending which is harmful to the Nation. We need to look at it very closely.

Often amendments are brought to the floor that many Members will say this is just draconian. We can't manage to spend less money here. Okay, so we offer earmark amendments and people say, well, it is just a small portion of the Federal budget. It is kind of like either the porridge is too hot or the porridge is too cold. When is the right time to offer an amendment to try to save taxpayers money?

So this is money that under the certification letter the funding would be used for renovation of the Edmonds Center for the Arts. Again, there are a number of earmarks that do this. I assume, frankly, there are Members of both parties that are requesting this funding. But it needs to be put in context because every time we so-called "invest" in a project like this, there is somebody out in America that is being divested in order to pay for the investment. So we have to look very closely at where this money is coming from.

Now, Member after Member comes to the floor to tell us we should do everything we can to preserve the Social Security trust fund. We know under our unified budget today that as long as we are running a deficit, and unfortu-

nately we still are, it is declining due to lots of tax revenue, but we still have a deficit. We know that this expenditure is going to come ultimately out of the Social Security trust fund. Yet so many Members come to the floor to decry the practice. So is this money going to the Edmonds Center for the Arts worth raiding the Social Security trust fund? I believe not.

In addition, we know that the Democrats, Mr. Chairman, in their budget resolution, it contains the single largest tax increase in American history. Over 5 years if we don't figure out a way to stop it, the average American family will have an average \$3,000 a year tax burden. That is money coming out of their pocket that they could have used for their arts, their entertainment, and their transportation; but they are being divested in order to invest in centers for the arts.

As I said earlier, I have no doubt that the sponsor of the earmark knows his district better than I do, just like I know my district better than he does. In talking to people in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, they think their tax money might be used for better purposes. And if it is going to go to art centers, they kind of prefer that Mesquite Art Center be funded. They prefer the Henderson County Performing Arts Center be funded. They prefer the Lake Country Playhouse in Mineola to be funded; and they prefer the Kaufman County Civic Theater in Terrell, Texas, be funded, and the list goes on.

Given that we are threatened with the single largest tax increase in history, a vote for this is to raid the Social Security trust fund. And already with the spending we have, we are due to double taxes on the next generation.

I know Congress has the right to do this. I don't question our authority; I question our wisdom in doing that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. This is a misguided amendment. It is quite a surprise that of all of the decent efforts to help communities across the country, for some reason the gentleman picked this one. That is something beyond at least my understanding. The particular project involved here is a community center that is involved in a whole host of youth projects, including the Edmonds Boys and Girls Club, the Sno-King County Youth Club, the Triple Threat Basketball Club, the Brighton School, the Cascade Symphony Orchestra, the Edmonds High School Multi-Class Reunion, the Olympic Ballet Theater, the Sno-King Community Chorale, and Edmonds Community College.

I don't know why those seem like such un-American activities to the

gentleman, but to our community and to the country at large, those are integral parts of our communities. I may note this is not a situation where somehow there has been some sort of Federal largesse, that is an intrusion into the community.

This is an effort where we have multiple parties that have been associated with funding this project. This is not just the Federal Government. In fact, it is less than 10 percent of the entire project. It is financed with Federal funds. It is largely a matter of local development, including a variety of local corporations. So where we have less than 10 percent in this final phase, why this has been selected doesn't make sense.

Now there is a difference, I suppose. I hold a press release from the author of the amendment dated February 28, 2007, announcing that the city of Winnsboro, Texas, had received \$100,000 in Federal funds. The author of the amendment said: "I am excited that some of the hard-earned tax dollars sent to Washington are flowing back into the county." There is a difference, I suppose, between that money flowing to Edmonds, Washington. In that case it was money going to the proponent of this amendment. In this case it goes to a different one. I am not sure I understand the difference.

I guess the difference is the money that went to Texas was chosen by the bureaucrats. The money that is selected here has been chosen by the United States House of Representatives. Now, I don't know why the proponent believes there is some intrinsic genius of the bureaucrats. Some believe all bureaucrats are smarter than all Congressmen, or the least wise bureaucrat is smarter than the most intelligent Congressman. Some may hold that view; I don't.

We have a valid community purpose here. We have a small Federal commitment, and we have a useful thing that is helping kids at risk as well as community development. I note that an economic evaluation of this particular project showed that it would have significant economic value as well as community value in helping the kids in these local communities.

So I would commend this small investment of Federal dollars in this community.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.



The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield time to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER).

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

In 1941, the United States was building up for World War II in dire need of new sources of energy. The Tennessee Valley Authority obtained Federal authority for construction of a hydroelectric dam in Swain County, North Carolina. This construction required that an important road be flooded. In a 1943 agreement, the Federal Government promised to rebuild the road.

In the 64 years since the agreement was signed, no road has been completed and no settlement was offered to the people of Swain County. The 2001 Transportation bill provided \$16 million to study the environmental costs of building this new road. The National Park Service will complete this study in September.

□ 1700

Mr. Chairman, the financial and economical costs are too high to build this road. The National Park Service has said that the final environmental impact study will recommend a cash settlement with the people of Swain County.

Senators ALEXANDER and DOLE have amended the Senate version of this bill with language to allow the Park Service to use remaining funds from this study for this solution. This common-sense solution enjoys strong bipartisan support in the North Carolina and Tennessee House delegations.

Mr. Chairman, would you be willing to work with me and Congressman WAMP to ensure that this bipartisan language is included in the final conference version of this bill?

Mr. OLVER. I would like to thank the gentleman for bringing this issue to our attention.

Sixty-four years is a long and, it seems, quite unreasonable time to wait for the government to resolve this issue. So I pledge to work with you both on this issue as we move forward in this process and conference this bill with the Senate.

Mr. SHULER. Thank you, and I would like to thank my colleague ZACK WAMP for his hard work along with this bill, and I certainly thank the chairman for your hard work and your dedication.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to Mr. CROWLEY from New York also for a colloquy.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and want to commend you and the ranking member and your staffs for the hard work that has been put into this bill. I would also like to engage you, as you mentioned, in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased the committee included \$15.8 million to hire

and train new air traffic controllers. This will go a long way in helping to ensure the safety of our skies. However, I believe that more needs to be done.

I note that we have 1,100 fewer fully certified air traffic controllers than we did on 9/11.

Mr. Chairman, my concerns were underscored by a recent incident at La Guardia Airport, which is in my district in the Seventh Congressional District in Queens. As you know, La Guardia Airport is one of the busiest airports in the Nation. Over 1,000 flights a day and 27 million passengers a year frequent the airport.

On July 5 of this year, two planes nearly crashed on the runway. While a catastrophe was narrowly avoided this time, many questions remain as to the cause of the incident, including whether it was due to a staffing shortage, a lack of well-qualified air traffic controllers, or simply pure human error.

I believe we must examine the incident at La Guardia while we also examine the larger issue, which is determining how we must address the impending air traffic controller shortage. That is why I believe that Congress must fund a study by the National Academy of Sciences.

This study would examine what factors are contributing to air traffic safety concerns, including human factors, increased traffic activity, and the technology and equipment at our Nation's airports. Ultimately the report will recommend how to address this issue, particularly with regard to staffing standards and whether we need to train more air traffic controllers.

I intended to offer an amendment today to fund this study, but it would have been subject to a point of order. So instead, Mr. Chairman, I am hoping we can agree to work together as this legislation moves forward to find a way to address this issue and potentially fund this study.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, this is a vital public safety concern that we must address. I understand that the FAA has been working with the National Academy of Sciences and has factored in many of its recommendations from the Academy. The FAA is also working with Mitre algorithms, models and base assumptions.

I, too, want to ensure that the skies remain safe, and I will work with the gentleman to ensure an adequate number of controllers exist in that area.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond, I want to thank the chairman, and as you know, if we don't address this issue, the next incident at La Guardia may not be a near miss, but rather a tragedy, one that I hope we would avoid. And I would imagine if it were a tragedy, we would be having a different conversation than this colloquy.

I appreciate the gentleman for his time.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for parking facilities.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is aimed at limiting funding for parking facilities within this bill, which is not including Federal facilities that might be included within bills dealing with our military bases, GAO, national parks, what have you.

Mr. Chairman, apparently there are about 15 or so of these earmarks covering Members of both parties, and again, as I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, I know that the funds represented are probably a small portion of Federal spending, but I think it is good, I think it is wise that this House pause from time to time and look at the fiscal challenge that we are facing and to remember, if everything is a priority, then nothing is a priority.

So, again, I have no doubt that parking facilities are needed all over America, but I doubt the wisdom within the confines of this bill of using Federal taxpayer money today to pay for them.

Let's take a look at the challenge that we're facing, Mr. Chairman, and just don't take my word for the fact that we have a great fiscal challenge. Let's listen to our Federal Reserve Chairman, Ben Bernanke. He said recently, without "early and meaningful action" to address spending in Washington, "the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened; with future generations bearing much of the cost."

Let's listen to the Brookings Institute, not exactly a bastion of conservative thought: "The authors of this book believe that the Nation's fiscal situation is out of control and could do serious damage to the economy in coming decades."

Let's listen to the General Accountability Office: The rising costs of government spending, specifically entitlements, are "a fiscal cancer" that threatens "catastrophic consequences for our country" and could "bankrupt America."

Let's listen again to the GAO: "Absent policy changes on the spending and/or revenue sides of the budget, a growing imbalance between expected Federal spending and tax revenues will mean escalating and ultimately unsustainable Federal deficits and debt

that serve to threaten our future national security as well as the standard of living for the American people."

The Federal budget continues to grow way beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for it, and seemingly, the only standard for spending the people's money today is do we have a noble purpose, and can some good use be made of the money. But, Mr. Chairman, that standard is not sufficient. It's not sufficient when we're threatening future generations with a fiscal calamity. Sooner or later, this body needs to say enough is enough.

Almost every State in the Union, I think, save but two or three, are running a surplus. We're running a deficit, and what are we doing? We're funding local parking facilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not here to debate the constitutionality of doing that, but, again, I'm here to debate the wisdom, given the fiscal challenges the Nation faces, and all too often I fear that this body is more focused on the next election and not the next generation. But the Comptroller General has said we're on the verge of being the first generation in America's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, fiscal responsibility has to be included in each and every bill, and we have a bill that's growing about 6.7 percent. Let's somewhere draw a line in the sand on behalf of American families, on behalf of American taxpayers, on behalf of future generations and just say, you know, today the Federal taxpayer and future generations are not going to have to pay for parking facilities. It's all this amendment is about, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment is undoubtedly trying to get at some egregious earmarks that are funded in this bill or in some other bill; however, in drafting a provision that is so broad in scope that what we have is an amendment that's careless.

There are legitimate parking facilities that can be built using Federal funds, and I use an example, for instance, the parking facilities that we have with elder housing projects, built in various places around the country, but this amendment would kill that.

Under current law Federal funds can be used to fund park-and-ride facilities and other activities aimed at encouraging carpooling and vanpooling. In fact, these activities are of such a high priority that they're eligible for 100 percent Federal funding and require no State or local match. Similarly, Federal funds are used to build safety rest areas along our interstates. This amendment would put an end to that.

For these reasons and others, this amendment must be defeated.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that this bill funds what we call the 811 program, housing for disabled. Now, I don't know why we would want to say that we would vote money to build housing for the disabled but no parking. Have we found a new group of totally mobile disabled?

I mean, this amendment would say that if you got funds under the 811 program to build housing for disabled people, you couldn't provide parking for vans, for transportation. I'm really baffled as to the scope, and I do think that telling people that they could not provide parking at a disabled housing facility is a very poor idea.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this money's going to have to come from somewhere. So, again, I would invite the committee chairman to tell us, is this part of the largest tax increase in history? Is this coming out of the Social Security Trust Fund? Is this going to be debt passed on to future generations? Where is the money going to come from? Does it reach that purpose?

And I cannot believe that the only parking lots that are made available to those who are disabled are somehow coming from the Federal taxpayer. I just don't believe it.

With that, I would urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the answer to the gentleman from Texas is when you have federally funded housing for the disabled, the parking that goes for the disabled and the service vehicles comes from that money. So the gentleman says, why does the Federal Government have to pay for parking? I don't know who else the gentleman thinks is going to pay for parking at housing that is built for people who are disabled.

If the gentleman is unhappy with this, then perhaps he should draft his amendments more seriously.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Parking facilities are eligible under a number of our surface transportation

programs, funded out of the Highway Trust Fund. In the SAFETEA-LU legislation, we authorize funding for parking facilities to encourage commuters to park their vehicles and use public transportation.

Congestion is a growing problem all across this country. It costs us \$68 billion a year. The more cars we can get off the roadway and more people use public transportation, the better off citizens are in their drive patterns. And the parking facilities encourage carpooling, vanpooling and use of light rail and commuter rail and local bus transit operations.

Furthermore, because they're funded with Highway Trust Fund moneys, no fees can be charged at these parking facilities, so they're not revenue-generating activities.

Furthermore, we have imposed very strict standards for highway safety for long-haul truckers. Hours of service have been limited so that roadways will be safer, but those long-haul truckers, working long hours, need safe places where they can rest.

□ 1715

The hours of service limitation requires them to stay off the roadway before they become fatigued. That's why we have parking facilities to accommodate over-the-road truck drivers, as well as passenger vehicle drivers.

So the parking facilities we provide under the SAFETEA-LU national transportation program is in the best public interest, in the interest of public safety and in the interest of roadway safety, to the best interest of the driving public, reduces congestion, and we ought not to take this broad brush stroke and strike the spending.

No, we carefully considered these issues in the course of fashioning the SAFETEA-LU in the House and the Senate and conference and on this House floor. Let's keep existing policy in place and defeat this misguided amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. WESTMORELAND of Georgia.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding Belmont Complex.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding the Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding Woodlake, California.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding the Rails to Trails program.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding the Houston Zoo.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

An amendment by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 116, noes 307, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 696]

#### AYES—116

Aderholt	Gingrey	Musgrave
Akin	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Goode	Paul
Baker	Goodlatte	Petri
Barrett (SC)	Graves	Pitts
Biggert	Hastert	Platts
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Bilirakis	Hayes	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Heller	Putnam
Blunt	Hensarling	Radanovich
Boehner	Herger	Ramstad
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Roskam
Ginny	Issa	Royce
Buchanan	Jindal	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Sali
Buyer	Jordan	Schmidt
Camp (MI)	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Sessions
Cannon	Kingston	Shadegg
Cantor	Kirk	Shuster
Carter	Kline (MN)	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Coble	Latham	Souder
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Davis, David	Linder	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Deal (GA)	E.	Thornberry
Drake	Mack	Tiahrt
Dreier	Manzullo	Tiberi
Duncan	Marchant	Upton
Ehlers	McCaul (TX)	Walberg
Feeney	McCotter	Wamp
Flake	McCrery	Westmoreland
Forbes	McHenry	Whitfield
Fossella	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	

#### NOES—307

Abercrombie	Arcuri	Barton (TX)
Ackerman	Baca	Bean
Alexander	Baird	Becerra
Allen	Baldwin	Berkley
Altmire	Barrow	Berman
Andrews	Bartlett (MD)	Berry

Bishop (GA)	Hare	Pallone
Bishop (NY)	Harman	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Bonner	Herseth Sandlin	Payne
Bono	Hill	Pearce
Bordallo	Hinchee	Perlmutter
Boren	Hinojosa	Peterson (MN)
Boswell	Hirono	Peterson (PA)
Boucher	Hobson	Pickering
Boustany	Hodes	Pomeroy
Boyd (FL)	Holden	Porter
Boyda (KS)	Holt	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hooley	Pryce (OH)
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Rahall
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Rangel
Brown, Corrine	Inslee	Regula
Burton (IN)	Israel	Rehberg
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Reichert
Calvert	Jackson-Lee	Renzi
Capito	(TX)	Reyes
Capps	Jefferson	Reynolds
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rodriguez
Cardoza	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Rogers (KY)
Carney	Jones (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson	Jones (OH)	Ross
Castle	Kagen	Rothman
Castor	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Chandler	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Christensen	Kennedy	Rush
Clay	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kilpatrick	Salazar
Clyburn	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	King (NY)	T.
Cole (OK)	Klein (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Knollenberg	Sarbanes
Cooper	Kucinich	Saxton
Costa	Kuhl (NY)	Schakowsky
Costello	LaHood	Schiff
Courtney	Lampson	Schwartz
Cramer	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Crenshaw	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sestak
Culberson	LaTourette	Shays
Cummings	Lee	Shea-Porter
Davis (AL)	Levin	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Shuler
Davis (KY)	Lipinski	Simpson
Davis, Lincoln	LoBiondo	Sires
DeFazio	Loeb	Skelton
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Delahunt	Lowey	Smith (NJ)
DeLauro	Lucas	Smith (WA)
Dent	Lynch	Snyder
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mahoney (FL)	Solis
Diaz-Balart, M.	Maloney (NY)	Space
Dicks	Markey	Spratt
Dingell	Matheson	Stark
Doggett	Matsui	Stupak
Donnelly	McCarthy (CA)	Sutton
Doolittle	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Doyle	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
Edwards	McDermott	Taylor
Ellison	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Ellsworth	McHugh	Thompson (MS)
Emanuel	McIntyre	Tierney
Emerson	McKeon	Towns
Engel	McMorris	Turner
English (PA)	Rodgers	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	McNerney	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	McNulty	Van Hollen
Everett	Meek (FL)	Velázquez
Faleomavaega	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Fallin	Melancon	Walden (OR)
Farr	Michaud	Walsh (NY)
Fattah	Miller (MI)	Walz (MN)
Ferguson	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Filner	Miller, George	Schultz
Fortenberry	Mitchell	Waters
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Moore (KS)	Watt
Gallely	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Gerlach	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Welch (VT)
Gilchrest	Murphy, Patrick	Weldon (FL)
Gillibrand	Murphy, Tim	Weller
Gillmor	Murtha	Wexler
Gonzalez	Nadler	Wicker
Gordon	Napolitano	Wilson (NM)
Granger	Neal (MA)	Wilson (OH)
Green, Al	Norton	Woolsey
Green, Gene	Nunes	Wu
Grijalva	Oberstar	Wynn
Gutierrez	Obey	Yarmuth
Hall (NY)	Oliver	Young (FL)
Hall (TX)	Ortiz	

#### NOT VOTING—13

Bachus	Fortuño	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Higgins	Tancred
Clarke	Honda	Young (AK)
Cubin	Marshall	
Davis, Jo Ann	Myrick	

□ 1741

Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CAMP of Michigan changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

Members will be reminded there will be seven 2-minute votes to follow.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 283, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 697]

#### AYES—139

Aderholt	Feeney	Marchant
Akin	Flake	McCarthy (CA)
Bachmann	Forbes	McCaul (TX)
Baker	Fortuño	McCrery
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	McHenry
Bartlett (MD)	Foxx	McKeon
Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Mica
Biggert	Gallely	Miller (FL)
Bilbray	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (MI)
Bilirakis	Gillmor	Miller, Gary
Blackburn	Gingrey	Moran (KS)
Blunt	Gohmert	Musgrave
Boehner	Goode	Neugebauer
Boozman	Goodlatte	Nunes
Brown (SC)	Granger	Paul
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Pearce
Ginny	Hastert	Perlmutter
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)
Burgess	Hayes	Petri
Burton (IN)	Heller	Pitts
Buyer	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Calvert	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Camp (MI)	Hobson	Radanovich
Campbell (CA)	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Cannon	Hulshof	Regula
Cantor	Hunter	Reichert
Capito	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Coble	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Conaway	Jordan	Royce
Cooper	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	King (IA)	Sali
Davis, David	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Sessions
Deal (GA)	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Shays
Drake	Lamborn	Shuster
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Linder	Smith (TX)
Emerson	Lungren, Daniel	Souder
Everett	E.	Terry
Fallin	Mack	Thornberry
	Manzullo	Tiahrt

Tiberi  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)

Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller

Westmoreland  
Wicker  
Wilson (SC)

Wolf  
Woolsey

Wu  
Wynn

Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

Berry  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis

Gordon  
Granger  
Graves

Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)

# NOES—283

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castle  
Castor  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conyers  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Faleomavaega  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fortenberry  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez

Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jindal  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano

Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickering  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Vislosky  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)

Bachus  
Bishop (UT)  
Clarke  
Cubin  
Davis, Jo Ann

Diaz-Balart, L.  
Higgins  
Honda  
Marshall  
Myrick

## NOT VOTING—14

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN  
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised they have less than 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1746

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas and Mr. PICKERING changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE  
The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Belmont Complex on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE  
The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

Members are reminded to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 335, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 698]

## AYES—87

Akin  
Bachmann  
Barrett (SC)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Blackburn  
Brady (TX)  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Davis, David  
Deal (GA)  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Flake  
Fortenberry  
Fossella

## NOES—335

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire

Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin

Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Hulshof  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Jindal  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
Kline (MN)  
Lamborn  
Linder  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley (TX)  
McHenry  
Mica

Miller (FL)  
Musgrave  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Pearce  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe  
Price (GA)  
Ramstad  
Rohrabacher  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Smith (NE)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Upton  
Walden (OR)  
Weldon (FL)  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (SC)

Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castor  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conyers  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Faleomavaega  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortuño  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez  
Goode

Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell

Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez

Visclosky	Watt	Wilson (OH)
Walberg	Waxman	Wolf
Walsh (NY)	Weiner	Woolsey
Walz (MN)	Welch (VT)	Wu
Wamp	Weller	Wynn
Wasserman	Wexler	Yarmuth
Schultz	Whitfield	Young (FL)
Waters	Wicker	
Watson	Wilson (NM)	

## NOT VOTING—14

Bachus	Higgins	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Honda	Reynolds
Clarke	Marshall	Tancred
Cubin	Myrick	Young (AK)
Davis, Jo Ann	Pence	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded that they have 1 minute remaining to vote.

□ 1750

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding the Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are admonished to stay in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 68, noes 356, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 699]

## AYES—68

Akin	Gingrey	Pitts
Bachmann	Graves	Price (GA)
Barrett (SC)	Hastert	Putnam
Blackburn	Heller	Radanovich
Boehner	Hensarling	Ramstad
Burton (IN)	Inglis (SC)	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Issa	Roskam
Campbell (CA)	Jindal	Royce
Cannon	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Keller	Sali
Chabot	King (IA)	Schmidt
Coble	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lamborn	Sessions
Cooper	Linder	Shadegg
Davis, David	Mack	Shimkus
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Stearns
Duncan	McHenry	Sullivan
Feeney	Mica	Terry
Flake	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Fossella	Musgrave	Walberg
Foxx	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Pearce	

## NOES—356

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Bilirakis
Ackerman	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (NY)
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Blumenauer
Allen	Bean	Blunt
Altmire	Becerra	Bonner
Andrews	Berkley	Bono
Arcuri	Berman	Boozman
Baca	Berry	Bordallo
Baird	Biggert	Boren
Baker	Bilbray	Boswell

Boucher	Green, Gene	Miller (NC)
Boustany	Grijalva	Miller, Gary
Boyd (FL)	Gutierrez	Miller, George
Boyd (KS)	Hall (NY)	Mitchell
Brady (PA)	Hall (TX)	Mollohan
Brady (TX)	Hare	Moore (KS)
Braley (IA)	Harman	Moore (WI)
Brown (SC)	Hastings (FL)	Moran (KS)
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (WA)	Moran (VA)
Brown-Waite,	Hayes	Murphy (CT)
Ginny	Herger	Murphy, Patrick
Buchanan	Hereth Sandlin	Murphy, Tim
Burgess	Hill	Murtha
Butterfield	Hinche	Nadler
Calvert	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Camp (MI)	Hirono	Neal (MA)
Capito	Hobson	Norton
Capps	Hodes	Oberstar
Capuano	Hoekstra	Obey
Cardoza	Holden	Oliver
Carnahan	Holt	Ortiz
Carney	Hooley	Pallone
Carson	Hoyer	Pascarell
Carter	Hulshof	Pastor
Castle	Hunter	Paul
Castor	Inslee	Payne
Chandler	Israel	Perlmutter
Christensen	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (PA)
Cleaver	(TX)	Petri
Clyburn	Jefferson	Pickering
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Platts
Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Poe
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Costa	Johnson, Sam	Porter
Costello	Jones (NC)	Price (NC)
Courtney	Jones (OH)	Pryce (OH)
Cramer	Kagen	Rahall
Crenshaw	Kanjorski	Rangel
Crowley	Kaptur	Regula
Cuellar	Kennedy	Rehberg
Culberson	Kildee	Reichert
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Renzi
Davis (AL)	Kind	Reyes
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Reynolds
Davis (IL)	Kingston	Rodriguez
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Lincoln	Klein (FL)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Tom	Knollenberg	Rogers (MI)
DeFazio	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
DeGette	Kuhl (NY)	Ross
DeLauro	LaHood	Rothman
Dent	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart, L.	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lantos	Rush
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Salazar
Doggett	Latham	Sánchez, Linda
Donnelly	LaTourette	T.
Doolittle	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle	Levin	Sarbanes
Drake	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Dreier	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Edwards	Lewis (KY)	Schiff
Ehlers	Lipinski	Schwartz
Ellison	LoBiondo	Scott (GA)
Ellsworth	Loeb	Scott (VA)
Emanuel	Loftgren, Zoe	Serrano
Emerson	Lowe	Sestak
Engel	Lucas	Shays
English (PA)	Lungren, Daniel	Shea-Porter
Eshoo	E.	Sherman
Etheridge	Lynch	Shuler
Everett	Mahoney (FL)	Shuster
Faleomavaega	Maloney (NY)	Simpson
Fallin	Manzullo	Sires
Farr	Markey	Skelton
Fattah	Matheson	Slaughter
Ferguson	Matsui	Smith (NE)
Filner	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (TX)
Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)	Smith (WA)
Fortuño	McCollum (MN)	Snyder
Frank (MA)	McColter	Solis
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Souder
Gallely	McDermott	Space
Gerlach	McGovern	Spratt
Giffords	McHugh	Stark
Gilchrest	McIntyre	Stupak
Gillibrand	McKeon	Sutton
Gillmor	McMorris	Tanner
Gohmert	Rodgers	Tauscher
Gonzalez	McNerney	Taylor
Goode	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Goodlatte	Meek (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	Tiahrt
Granger	Melancon	Tiberi
Green, Al	Michaud	Tierney
	Miller (MI)	Towns

Turner	Wasserman	Whitfield
Udall (CO)	Schultz	Wicker
Udall (NM)	Waters	Wilson (NM)
Upton	Watson	Wilson (OH)
Van Hollen	Watt	Wolf
Velázquez	Waxman	Woolsey
Visclosky	Weiner	Wu
Walden (OR)	Welch (VT)	Wynn
Walsh (NY)	Weldon (FL)	Yarmuth
Walz (MN)	Weller	Young (FL)
Wamp	Wexler	

## NOT VOTING—12

Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Myrick
Bishop (UT)	Higgins	Pence
Clarke	Honda	Tancred
Cubin	Marshall	Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded that there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1755

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Woodlake, California, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are urged in the strongest terms to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 69, noes 352, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 700]

## AYES—69

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Nunes
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Petri
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Pitts
Bilbray	Graves	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hastert	Putnam
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Ramstad
Ginny	Hensarling	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Roskam
Burgess	Issa	Royce
Buyer	Jindal	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Sali
Cannon	King (IA)	Schmidt
Cantor	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Coble	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Linder	Stearns
Cooper	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Davis, David	E.	Thornberry
Deal (GA)	Mack	Walberg
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Feeney	Mica	Westmoreland
Flake	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Fossella	Musgrave	

## NOES—352

Abercrombie	Baca	Berkley
Ackerman	Baird	Berman
Aderholt	Baker	Berry
Alexander	Baldwin	Biggert
Allen	Barrow	Bilirakis
Altmire	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Bean	Bishop (NY)
Arcuri	Becerra	Blumenauer

Blunt	Gordon	Michaud	Tiahrt	Walsh (NY)	Wexler	Baird	Foxx	McIntyre
Boehner	Granger	Miller (MI)	Tiberi	Walz (MN)	Whitfield	Baker	Frank (MA)	McKeon
Bonner	Green, Al	Miller (NC)	Tierney	Wamp	Wicker	Baldwin	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Bono	Green, Gene	Miller, Gary	Towns	Wasserman	Wilson (NM)	Barrow	Gallegly	Rodgers
Boozman	Grijalva	Miller, George	Turner	Schultz	Wilson (OH)	Bartlett (MD)	Gerlach	McNerney
Bordallo	Gutierrez	Mitchell	Udall (CO)	Waters	Wolf	Barton (TX)	Giffords	McNulty
Boyd (FL)	Hall (NY)	Mollohan	Udall (NM)	Watson	Woolsey	Bean	Gilchrest	Meek (FL)
Boyd (KS)	Hall (TX)	Moore (KS)	Upton	Watt	Wu	Becerra	Gillibrand	Meeks (NY)
Brady (PA)	Hare	Moore (WI)	Van Hollen	Waxman	Wynn	Berkley	Gillmor	Melancon
Brady (TX)	Harman	Moran (KS)	Velázquez	Weiner	Yarmuth	Berman	Gonzalez	Michaud
Braley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)	Visclosky	Welch (VT)	Young (FL)	Berry	Goode	Miller (MI)
Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (CT)	Walden (OR)	Weller		Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Miller (NC)
Brown (IN)	Hayes	Murphy, Patrick				Bishop (GA)	Gordon	Miller, Gary
Butterfield	Herger	Murphy, Tim				Bishop (NY)	Granger	Miller, George
Calvert	Hereth Sandlin	Murtha	Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Myrick	Blumenauer	Green, Al	Mitchell
Camp (MI)	Hill	Nadler	Bishop (UT)	Donnelly	Obey	Blunt	Green, Gene	Mollohan
Capito	Hinchey	Napolitano	Clarke	Higgins	Pence	Bonner	Grijalva	Moore (KS)
Capps	Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	Conyers	Honda	Tancredo	Bono	Gutierrez	Moore (WI)
Capuano	Hirono	Norton	Cubin	Marshall	Young (AK)	Boozman	Hall (NY)	Moran (KS)
Cardoza	Hobson	Oberstar				Bordallo	Hall (TX)	Moran (VA)
Carnahan	Hodes	Oliver				Boren	Hare	Murphy (CT)
Carney	Hoekstra	Ortiz				Boswell	Harman	Murphy, Patrick
Carson	Holden	Pallone				Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Tim
Carter	Holt	Pascarell				Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Murtha
Castle	Hooley	Pastor				Boyd (FL)	Hayes	Napolitano
Castor	Hoyer	Paul				Boyda (KS)	Herger	Neal (MA)
Chandler	Hulshof	Payne				Brady (PA)	Hereth Sandlin	Norton
Christensen	Hunter	Pearce				Braley (IA)	Hill	Oberstar
Clay	Inslee	Perlmutter				Brown (SC)	Hinchey	Obeys
Cleaver	Israel	Peterson (MN)				Brown, Corrine	Hinojosa	Oliver
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (PA)				Buchanan	Hirono	Ortiz
Cohen	Jackson-Lee	Pickering				Butterfield	Hobson	Pallone
Cole (OK)	(TX)	Platts				Buyer	Hodes	Pascarell
Costa	Jefferson	Poe				Calvert	Hoekstra	Pastor
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Pomeroy				Capito	Holden	Paul
Courtney	Johnson (IL)	Porter				Capps	Holt	Payne
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)				Capuano	Hooley	Perlmutter
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)				Cardoza	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Crowley	Jones (NC)	Radanovich				Carnahan	Hunter	Peterson (PA)
Cuellar	Jones (OH)	Rahall				Carney	Inslee	Pickering
Culberson	Kagen	Rangel				Carson	Israel	Platts
Cummings	Kanjorski	Regula				Castle	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Rehberg				Castor	Jackson-Lee	Porter
Davis (CA)	Keller	Reichert				Chandler	(TX)	Price (NC)
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Renzi				Christensen	Jefferson	Pryce (OH)
Davis (KY)	Kildee	Reyes				Clay	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Davis, Lincoln	Kilpatrick	Reynolds				Cleaver	Johnson (IL)	Rangel
Davis, Tom	Kind	Rodriguez				Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Regula
DeFazio	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)				Cohen	Jones (NC)	Rehberg
DeGette	Kirk	Rogers (KY)				Cole (OK)	Jones (OH)	Reichert
DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Rogers (MI)				Conyers	Kagen	Renzi
Dent	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen				Costa	Kanjorski	Reyes
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kucinich	Ross				Costello	Kaptur	Reynolds
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Rothman				Courtney	Keller	Rodriguez
Dicks	LaHood	Roybal-Allard				Cramer	Kennedy	Rogers (AL)
Dingell	Lampson	Ruppersberger				Crenshaw	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Doggett	Langevin	Rush				Crowley	Kilpatrick	Rogers (MI)
Doolittle	Lantos	Ryan (OH)				Cuellar	Kind	Ros-Lehtinen
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Salazar				Culberson	King (NY)	Ross
Drake	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda				Cummings	Kirk	Rothman
Dreier	Latham	T.				Davis (AL)	Klein (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	LaTourette	Sanchez, Loretta				Davis (CA)	Knollenberg	Ruppersberger
Ehlers	Lee	Sarbanes				Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Rush
Ellison	Levin	Saxton				Davis (KY)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Ellsworth	Lewis (CA)	Schakowsky				Davis, Lincoln	LaHood	Salazar
Emanuel	Lewis (GA)	Schiff				Davis, Tom	Lampson	Sánchez, Linda
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Schwartz				DeFazio	Langevin	T.
Engel	Lipinski	Scott (GA)				DeGette	Lantos	Sanchez, Loretta
English (PA)	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)				Delahunt	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Loeb sack	Serrano				DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Saxton
Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe	Sessions				Dent	Latham	Schakowsky
Everett	Lowey	Sestak				Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourette	Schiff
Faleomavaega	Lucas	Shays				Diaz-Balart, M.	Lee	Levin
Fallin	Lynch	Shea-Porter				Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Scott (GA)
Farr	Mahoney (FL)	Sherman				Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Shimkus				Doggett	Lewis (KY)	Serrano
Ferguson	Manzullo	Shuler				Donnelly	Lipinski	Shays
Filner	Marchant	Shuster				Doolittle	LoBiondo	Shea-Porter
Forbes	Markey	Simpson				Doyle	Loeb sack	Sherman
Fortenberry	Matheson	Sires				Drake	Lofgren, Zoe	Shimkus
Fortuño	Matsui	Skelton				Edwards	Lowey	Shuler
Foxx	McCarthy (CA)	Slaughter				Ehlers	Lucas	Shuster
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (NJ)				Ellison	Lynch	Simpson
Frelinghuysen	McCollum (MN)	Smith (TX)				Ellsworth	Mahoney (FL)	Sires
Gallegly	McCotter	Smith (WA)				Emanuel	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
Gerlach	McCrery	Snyder				Emerson	Manzullo	Slaughter
Giffords	McDermott	Souder				Engel	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Gilchrest	McGovern	Space				English (PA)	Markey	Smith (TX)
Gillibrand	McHenry	Spratt				Eshoo	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Gillmor	McHugh	Stark				Etheridge	Matsui	Snyder
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Stupak				Everett	McCarthy (NY)	Solis
Goode	McMorris	Sutton				Farr	McCaul (TX)	Souder
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Tanner				Fattah	McCollum (MN)	Spratt
	McNerney	Tauscher				Ferguson	McCotter	Stark
	McNulty	Taylor				Filner	McCrery	Stupak
	Meek (FL)	Terry				Forbes	McDermott	Sutton
	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)				Fortenberry	McGovern	
	Melancon	Thompson (MS)				Fortuño	McHugh	

## NOT VOTING—15

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN  
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded that there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1759

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE  
The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding the Rails to Trails program on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE  
The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are strongly encouraged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 342, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

## AYES—81

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Nunes
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Petri
Biggart	Gohmert	Pitts
Bilbray	Graham	Poe
Blackburn	Hastert	Price (GA)
Boehner	Heller	Putnam
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Radanovich
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Ramstad
Ginny	Inglis (SC)	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Issa	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Royce
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Sali
Cannon	King (IA)	Schmidt
Cantor	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Chabot	Lamborn	Shadegg
Coble	Linder	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Cooper	E.	Sullivan
Davis, David	Mack	Terry
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Dreier	McHenry	Upton
Duncan	Mica	Walberg
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Flake	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Fossella	Neugebauer	

## NOES—342

Abercrombie	Alexander	Andrews
Ackerman	Allen	Arcuri
Aderholt	Altmire	Baca



Tanner Visclosky Weller  
Tauscher Walden (OR) Wexler  
Taylor Walsh (NY) Whitfield  
Thompson (CA) Walz (MN) Wicker  
Thompson (MS) Wamp Wilson (NM)  
Tiahrt Wasserman Wilson (OH)  
Tiberi Schultz Wolf  
Tierney Waters Woolsey  
Towns Watson Wu  
Turner Watt Wynn  
Udall (CO) Waxman Yarmuth  
Udall (NM) Weiner Young (FL)  
Van Hollen Welch (VT)  
Velázquez Weldon (FL)

## NOT VOTING—13

Bachus Faleomavaega Pence  
Bishop (UT) Higgins Tancredo  
Clarke Honda Young (AK)  
Cubin Marshall  
Davis, Jo Ann Myrick

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1802

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding the Houston Zoo on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are strongly encouraged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 77, noes 347, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 702]

## AYES—77

Akin Hastert Platts  
Bachmann Heller Price (GA)  
Barrett (SC) Hensarling Ramstad  
Bilbray Herger Rogers (MI)  
Burgess Hoekstra Rohrabacher  
Burton (IN) Hulshof Roskam  
Buyer Inglis (SC) Royce  
Camp (MI) Issa Ryan (WI)  
Campbell (CA) Jindal Salí  
Cannon Johnson (IL) Schmidt  
Chabot Jordan Sensenbrenner  
Coble King (IA) Sessions  
Conaway Kingston Shadegg  
Cooper Kline (MN) Shimkus  
Davis, David Lamborn Smith (NE)  
Deal (GA) Linder Souder  
Dreier Lungren, Daniel Stearns  
Duncan E. Sullivan  
Feeney Mack Terry  
Flake Mica Thornberry  
Fortenberry Miller (FL) Upton  
Fossella Musgrave Walberg  
Frank (MA) Neugebauer Walden (OR)  
Franks (AZ) Nunes Weldon (FL)  
Garrett (NJ) Petri Westmoreland  
Graves Pitts Wilson (SC)

## NOES—347

Abercrombie Altmire Baker  
Ackerman Andrews Baldwin  
Aderholt Arcuri Barrow  
Alexander Baca Bartlett (MD)  
Allen Baird Barton (TX)

Bean Fortunó McHenry  
Becerra Foss McHugh  
Berkley Frelinghuysen McIntyre  
Berman Gallegly McKeon  
Berry Gerlach McMorris  
Biggert Giffords Rodgers  
Bilirakis Gilchrest McNerney  
Bishop (GA) Gillibrand McNulty  
Bishop (NY) Gillmor Meek (FL)  
Blackburn Gingrey Meeks (NY)  
Blumenauer Gohmert Melancon  
Blunt Gonzalez Michaud  
Boehner Goode Miller (MI)  
Bonner Goodlatte Miller (NC)  
Bono Gordon Miller, Gary  
Boozman Granger Miller, George  
Bordallo Green, Al Mitchell  
Boren Green, Gene Molloy  
Boswell Grijalva Moore (KS)  
Boucher Gutierrez Moore (WI)  
Boustany Hall (NY) Moran (KS)  
Boyd (FL) Hall (TX) Moran (VA)  
Boyd (KS) Hare Murphy (CT)  
Brady (PA) Harman Murphy, Patrick  
Brady (TX) Hastings (FL) Murphy, Tim  
Braley (IA) Hastings (WA) Murtha  
Brown (SC) Hayes Nadler  
Brown, Corrine Hereth Sandlin  
Brown-Waite, Hill Neale (MA)  
Ginny Hinchey Norton  
Buchanan Hinojosa Oberstar  
Butterfield Hirono Obey  
Calvert Hobson Olver  
Cantor Hodes Ortiz  
Capito Holden Pallone  
Capps Holt Pascarell  
Capuano Hooley Pastor  
Cardoza Hoyer Paul  
Carnahan Hunter Payne  
Carney Inslee Pearce  
Carson Israel Perlmutter  
Carter Jackson (IL) Peterson (MN)  
Castle Jackson-Lee Peterson (PA)  
Castor (TX) Pickering  
Chandler Jefferson Poe  
Christensen Johnson (GA) Pomeroy  
Clay Johnson, E. B. Porter  
Cleaver Johnson, Sam Price (NC)  
Clyburn Jones (NC) Pryce (OH)  
Cohen Jones (OH) Putnam  
Cole (OK) Kagen Radanovich  
Conyers Kanjorski Rahall  
Costa Kaptur Rangel  
Costello Keller Regula  
Courtney Kennedy Rehberg  
Cramer Kildee Reichert  
Crenshaw Kilpatrick Renzi  
Crowley Kind Reyes  
Cuellar King (NY) Reynolds  
Culberson Kirk Rodriguez  
Cummings Klein (FL) Rogers (AL)  
Davis (AL) Knollenberg Rogers (KY)  
Davis (CA) Kucinich Ros-Lehtinen  
Davis (IL) Kuhl (NY) Ross  
Davis (KY) LaHood Rothman  
Davis, Lincoln Lampson Roybal-Allard  
Davis, Tom Langevin Ruppersberger  
DeFazio Lantos Rush  
DeGette Larsen (WA) Ryan (OH)  
Delahunt Larson (CT) Salazar  
DeLauro Latham Sánchez, Linda  
Dent LaTourette T.  
Diaz-Balart, L. Lee Sanchez, Loretta  
Dicks Levin Sarbanes  
Dingell Lewis (CA) Saxton  
Doggett Lewis (GA) Schakowsky  
Donnelly Lewis (KY) Schiff  
Doolittle Lipinski Schwartz  
Doyle LoBiondo Scott (GA)  
Drake Loeb sack Scott (VA)  
Edwards Lofgren, Zoe Serrano  
Ehlers Lowey Sestak  
Ellison Lucas Shays  
Ellsworth Mahoney (FL) Shea-Porter  
Emanuel Maloney (NY) Sherman  
Emerson Manzullo Shuler  
Engel Marchant Shuster  
English (PA) Markey Simpson  
Eshoo Matheson Sires  
Etheridge Matsui Skelton  
Everett McCarthy (CA) Slaughter  
Faleomavaega McCarthy (NY) Smith (NJ)  
Fallin McCaul (TX) Smith (TX)  
Farr McColm (MN) Smith (WA)  
Fattah McCotter Snyder  
Ferguson McCrery Solis  
Filner McDermott Space  
Forbes McGovern Spratt  
Stark

Stupak Van Hollen Weller  
Sutton Velázquez Wexler  
Tanner Visclosky Whitfield  
Tauscher Walsh (NY) Wicker  
Taylor Walz (MN) Wilson (NM)  
Thompson (CA) Wamp Wilson (OH)  
Thompson (MS) Wasserman Wolf  
Tiahrt Schultz Woolsey  
Tiberi Waters Wu  
Tierney Watson Wynn  
Towns Watt Yarmuth  
Turner Waxman Young (FL)  
Udall (CO) Weiner  
Udall (NM) Welch (VT)

## NOT VOTING—12

Bachus Davis, Jo Ann Myrick  
Bishop (UT) Higgins Pence  
Clarke Honda Tancredo  
Cubin Marshall Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1806

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, on roll-call No. 702, I inadvertently voted “yes.” My vote should have been recorded as a “no.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 268, noes 158, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 703]

## AYES—268

Abercrombie Brown-Waite, Davis (CA)  
Ackerman Ginny Davis (IL)  
Allen Butterfield Davis (KY)  
Altmire Calvert Davis, Lincoln  
Andrews Capito DeFazio  
Arcuri Capps DeGette  
Baca Cardoza Delahunt  
Baird Carney DeLauro  
Baldwin Carter Dent  
Barrow Castor Diaz-Balart, L.  
Bartlett (MD) Chabot Diaz-Balart, M.  
Becerra Chandler Dingell  
Berkley Christensen Doggett  
Berry Clay Donnelly  
Bilbray Cleaver Doyle  
Bishop (GA) Clyburn Ellison  
Bishop (NY) Cohen Ellsworth  
Blumenauer Cole (OK) Emerson  
Bono Conyers Engel  
Boozman Cooper English (PA)  
Bordallo Costa Eshoo  
Boren Courtney Etheridge  
Boswell Cramer Faleomavaega  
Boyd (FL) Crenshaw Farr  
Boyda (KS) Crowley Fattah  
Brady (PA) Cuellar Ferguson  
Brady (TX) Cummings Filner  
Braley (IA) Davis (AL) Fortenberry

Fortuño	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda T.	McMorris Rodgers	Pickering Pitts	Smith (NE) Smith (TX)	NOES—360			
Fossella	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta	Mica	Price (GA)	Souder	Abercrombie	Ehlers	LoBiondo	
Gallegly	Matheson	Sarbanes	Miller (MI)	Pryce (OH)	Spratt	Ackerman	Ellison	Loeb sack	
Gerlach	Matsui	Saxton	Miller, Gary	Putnam	Stearns	Akin	Ellsworth	Lofgren, Zoe	
Giffords	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky	Mitchell	Reichert	Thompson (CA)	Alexander	Emanuel	Lowey	
Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff	Moran (VA)	Reynolds	Turner	Allen	Emerson	Lucas	
Gillibrand	McCauley (TX)	Schwartz	Murphy (CT)	Rodriguez	Upton	Altmire	English (PA)	Lungren, Daniel E.	
Gohmert	McCollum (MN)	Scott (GA)	Musgrave	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen	Arcuri	Eshoo	Lynch	
Goodlatte	McCotter	Scott (VA)	Napolitano	Rogers (KY)	Velázquez	Baca	Etheridge	Mack	
Gordon	McDermott	Serrano	Nunes	Rohrabacher	Visclosky	Baird	Faleomavaega	Mahoney (FL)	
Green, Al	McGovern	Sestak	Oberstar	Rothman	Walberg	Baker	Fallin	Maloney (NY)	
Gutierrez	McHugh	Shea-Porter	Obey	Royce	Walden (OR)	Baldwin	Farr	Manzullo	
Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Sherman	Oliver	Schmidt	Wamp	Barrett (SC)	Feeney	Marchant	
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shimkus	Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)	Barrow	Filner	Markey	
Hare	McNerney	Shuler	Pastor	Sessions	Westmoreland	Barton (TX)	Flake	Matsui	
Harman	McNulty	Shuster	Pearce	Shadegg	Wicker	Bean	Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sires	Pence	Shays	Wilson (NM)	Becerra	Fortenberry	McCauley (TX)	
Heller	Meeks (NY)	Skelton	Peterson (PA)	Simpson	Wolf	Berkley	Fortuño	McCollum (MN)	
Herse th Sandlin	Melancon	Slaughter	Petri	NOT VOTING—10					McCrery
Hill	Michaud	Smith (NJ)	Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Myrick	Berry	Fox	McDermott	
Hinchey	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)	Bishop (UT)	Higgins	Young (AK)	Biggart	Frank (MA)	McGovern	
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Snyder	Bishop	Honda		Bilbray	Franks (AZ)	McHenry	
Hobson	Miller, George	Solis	Clarke	Marshall		Bilirakis	Giffords	McHugh	
Hodes	Mollohan	Space	Cubin			Bishop (GA)	Gilchrest	McIntyre	
Holt	Moore (KS)	Stark				Bishop (NY)	Gillmor	McKeon	
Hooley	Moore (WI)	Stupak				Blackburn	Gingrey	McMorris	
Hoyer	Moran (KS)	Sullivan				Blumenauer	Gonzalez	Rodgers	
Inslee	Murphy, Patrick	Sutton				Boehner	Goodlatte	McNerney	
Israel	Murphy, Tim	Tancred o				Bonner	Gordon	McNulty	
Issa	Murtha	Tanner				Bono	Granger	Meek (FL)	
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Tauscher				Boozman	Graves	Meeks (NY)	
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Neal (MA)	Taylor				Bordallo	Green, Al	Melancon	
Jefferson	Neugebauer	Terry				Boren	Green, Gene	Mica	
Johnson (GA)	Norton	Thompson (MS)				Boswell	Grijalva	Michaud	
Johnson (IL)	Pascarell	Thornberry				Boucher	Gutierrez	Miller (MI)	
Jones (NC)	Paul	Tiahrt				Boustany	Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary	
Jones (OH)	Payne	Tiberi				Boyd (FL)	Hare	Miller, George	
Kagen	Perlmutter	Tierney				Boyda (KS)	Harman	Mitchell	
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Towns				Brady (PA)	Hastert	Mollohan	
Kaptur	Platts	Udall (CO)				Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Moore (KS)	
Kennedy	Poe	Udall (NM)				Braley (IA)	Hayes	Moore (WI)	
Kildee	Pomeroy	Walsh (NY)				Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Moran (KS)	
Kilpatrick	Porter	Walz (MN)				Brown, Corrine	Herger	Moran (VA)	
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Wasserman				Burgess	Herseth Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick	
Klein (FL)	Radanovich	Schultz				Burton (IN)	Hill	Murphy, Tim	
Kucinich	Rahall	Waters				Butterfield	Hinojosa	Murtha	
Kuhl (NY)	Ramstad	Watson				Buyer	Hirono	Musgrave	
Langevin	Rangel	Watt				Camp (MI)	Hobson	Nadler	
Lantos	Regula	Waxman				Campbell (CA)	Hodes	Napolitano	
LaTourette	Rehberg	Weiner				Capito	Hoekstra	Neal (MA)	
Lee	Renzi	Welch (VT)				Capps	Holden	Neugebauer	
Levin	Reyes	Weller				Capuano	Hookey	Norton	
Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Wexler				Cardoza	Hoyer	Oberstar	
Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield				Carnahan	Hulshof	Obey	
Linder	Roskam	Wilson (OH)				Carney	Hunter	Oliver	
LoBiondo	Ross	Wilson (SC)				Carson	Inglis (SC)	Ortiz	
Loeb sack	Ruppersberger	Woolsey				Castor	Inslee	Pastor	
Lowey	Rush	Wu				Chabot	Jackson (IL)	Paul	
Lucas	Ryan (OH)	Wynn				Clay	Jackson-Lee	Pearce	
Lynch	Ryan (WI)	Yarmuth				Cleaver	(TX)	Pence	
Mahoney (FL)	Salazar	Young (FL)				Clyburn	Jefferson	Perlmutter	
Maloney (NY)	Sali					Coble	Jindal	Peterson (MN)	
						Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Peterson (PA)	
						Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Petri	
						Conaway	Johnson, E. B.	Pickering	
						Conyers	Johnson, Sam	Pitts	
						Cooper	Jones (OH)	Platts	
						Costa	Jordan	Poe	
						Costello	Kagen	Pomeroy	
						Courtney	Kanjorski	Porter	
						Cramer	Kaptur	Price (GA)	
						Crenshaw	Keller	Price (NC)	
						Crowley	Kennedy	Pryce (OH)	
						Cuellar	Kildee	Putnam	
						Cummings	Kilpatrick	Rahall	
						Davis (AL)	Kind	Ramstad	
						Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Rangel	
						Davis (IL)	Kingston	Regula	
						Davis (KY)	Kirk	Rehberg	
						Davis, David	Klein (FL)	Reichert	
						Davis, Lincoln	Kline (MN)	Renzi	
						Davis, Tom	Knollenberg	Reyes	
						Deal (GA)	Kucinich	Rodriguez	
						DeFazio	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (AL)	
						DeGette	LaHood	Rogers (KY)	
						Delahunt	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)	
						DeLauro	Lampson	Rohrabacher	
						Dent	Langevin	Roskam	
						Diaz-Balart, L.	Lantos	Ross	
						Diaz-Balart, M.	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard	
						Dicks	Larson (CT)	Royce	
						Dingell	Latham	Ruppersberger	
						Doggett	LaTourette	Rush	
						Donnelly	Lee	Ryan (OH)	
						Doyle	Levin	Ryan (WI)	
						Drake	Lewis (GA)	Salazar	
						Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Sánchez, Linda T.	
						Edwards	Lipinski		

NOES—158

Aderholt

Akin

Alexander

Bachmann

Baker

Barrett (SC)

Barton (TX)

Bean

Berman

Biggart

Bilirakis

Blackburn

Blunt

Boehner

Bonner

Boucher

Boustany

Brown (SC)

Brown, Corrine

Buchanan

Burgess

Burton (IN)

Buyer

Camp (MI)

Campbell (CA)

Cannon

Cantor

Capuano

Carnahan

Carson

Castle

Coble

Conaway

Costello

Culberson

Davis, David

Davis, Tom

Deal (GA)

Dicks

Doolittle

Drake

Dreier

Duncan

Edwards

Ehlers

Emanuel

Everett

Fallin

Feeney

Flake

Forbes

Fox

Frank (MA)

Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen

Garrett (NJ)

Gillmor

Gingrey

Gonzalez

Goode

Granger

Graves

Green, Gene

Grijalva

Hastert

Hastings (WA)

Hayes

Hensarling

Herger

Hirono

Hoekstra

Holden

Hulshof

Hunter

Inglis (SC)

Jindal

Johnson, E. B.

Johnson, Sam

Jordan

Keller

Kind

King (IA)

Kingston

Kirk

Kline (MN)

Knollenberg

LaHood

Lamborn

Lampson

Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)

Latham

Lewis (KY)

Lipinski

Lofgren, Zoe

Lungren, Daniel E.

Mack

Marchant

McCrery

McHenry

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are urged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 65, noes 360, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 704]

AYES—65

Aderholt

Andrews

Bartlett (MD)

Blunt

Brown-Waite,

Buchanan

Calvert

Cannon

Cantor

Carter

Castle

Chandler

Christensen

Culberson

Doolittle

Dreier

Engel

Ferguson

Frelinghuysen

Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)

Gerlach

Gillibrand

Gohmert

Goode

Hall (NY)

Hastings (FL)

Heiler

Hinchey

Holt

Israel

Issa

Jones (NC)

King (IA)

Lewis (CA)

Linder

Matheson

McCarthy (NY)

McCotter

Miller (FL)

Miller (NC)

Murphy (CT)

Nunes

Pallone

Pascarell

Payne

Radanovich

Reynolds

Ros-Lehtinen

Rothman

Sali

Sensenbrenner

Sestak

Shays

Shimkus

Simpson

Tancred o

Terry

Thornberry

Waters

Weller

Whitfield

Wicker

Wilson (SC)

Young (FL)

NOES—158

Aderholt

Akin

Alexander

Bachmann

Baker

Barrett (SC)

Barton (TX)

Bean

Berman

Biggart

Bilirakis

Blackburn

Blunt

Boehner

Bonner

Boucher

Boustany

Brown (SC)

Brown, Corrine

Buchanan

Burgess

Burton (IN)

Buyer

Camp (MI)

Campbell (CA)

Cannon

Cantor

Capuano

Carnahan

Carson

Castle

Coble

Conaway

Costello

Culberson

Davis, David

Davis, Tom

Deal (GA)

Dicks

Doolittle

Drake

Dreier

Duncan

Edwards

Ehlers

Emanuel

Everett

Fallin

Feeney

Flake

Forbes

Fox

Frank (MA)

Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen

Garrett (NJ)

Gillmor

Gingrey

Gonzalez

Goode

Granger

Graves

Green, Gene

Grijalva

Hastert

Hastings (WA)

Hayes

Hensarling

Herger

Hirono

Hoekstra

Holden

Hulshof

Hunter

Inglis (SC)

Jindal

Johnson, E. B.

Johnson, Sam

Jordan

Keller

Kind

King (IA)

Kingston

Kirk

Kline (MN)

Knollenberg

LaHood

Lamborn

Lampson

Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)

Latham

Lewis (KY)

Lipinski

Lofgren, Zoe

Lungren, Daniel E.

Mack

Marchant

McCrery

McHenry

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are urged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 65, noes 360, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 704]

AYES—65

Aderholt

Andrews

Bartlett (MD)

Blunt

Brown-Waite,

Buchanan

Calvert

Cannon

Cantor

Carter

Castle

Chandler

Christensen

Culberson

Doolittle

Dreier

Engel

Ferguson

Frelinghuysen

Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)

Gerlach

Gillibrand

Gohmert

Goode

Hall (NY)

Hastings (FL)

Heiler

Hinchey

Holt

Israel

Issa

Jones (NC)

King (IA)

Lewis (CA)

Linder

Matheson

McCarthy (NY)

McCotter

Miller (FL)

Miller (NC)

Murphy (CT)

Nunes

Pallone

Pascarell

Payne

Radanovich

Reynolds

Ros-Lehtinen

Rothman

Sali

Sensenbrenner

Sestak

Shays

Shimkus

Simpson

Tancred o

Terry

Thornberry

Waters

Weller

Whitfield

Wicker

Wilson (SC)

Young (FL)

## NOES—158

Aderholt	Culberson	Herger
Akin	Davis, David	Hirono
Alexander	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Bachmann	Deal (GA)	Holden
Baker	Dicks	Hulshof
Barrett (SC)	Doolittle	Hunter
Barton (TX)	Drake	Inglis (SC)
Bean	Dreier	Jindal
Berman	Duncan	Johnson, E. B.
Biggart	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Jordan
Blackburn	Emanuel	Keller
Blunt	Everett	Kind
Boehner	Fallin	King (IA)
Bonner	Feeney	Kingston
Boucher	Flake	Kirk
Boustany	Forbes	Kline (MN)
Brown (SC)	Fox	Knollenberg
Brown, Corrine	Frank (MA)	LaHood
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Larsen (WA)
Buyer	Gillmor	Larson (CT)
Camp (MI)	Gingrey	Latham
Campbell (CA)	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Cannon	Goode	Lipinski
Cantor	Granger	Lofgren, Zoe
Capuano	Graves	Lungren, Daniel E.
Carnahan	Green, Gene	
Carson	Grijalva	
Castle	Hastert	
Coble	Hastings (WA)	
Conaway	Hayes	
Costello	Hensarling	

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are urged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 65, noes 360, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 704]

AYES—65

Aderholt	Gerlach	Pallone
Andrews	Gillibrand	Pascarell
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Payne
Blunt	Goode	Radanovich
Brown-Waite,	Hall (NY)	Reynolds
Ginny	Hastings (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Heller	Rothman
Calvert	Hinchey	Sali
Cannon	Holt	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Israel	Sestak
Carter	Issa	Shays
Castle	Jones (NC)	Shimkus
Chandler	King (IA)	Simpson
Christensen	Lewis (CA)	Tancred
Culberson	Linder	Terry
Doolittle	Matheson	Thornberry
Dreier	McCarthy (NY)	Waters
Engel	McCotter	Weller
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Miller (NC)	Wicker
Gallegly	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Nunes	Young (FL)

Sanchez, Loretta	Solis	Visclosky
Sarbanes	Souder	Walberg
Saxton	Space	Walden (OR)
Schakowsky	Spratt	Walsh (NY)
Schiff	Stark	Walz (MN)
Schmidt	Stearns	Wamp
Schwartz	Stupak	Wasserman
Scott (GA)	Sullivan	Schultz
Scott (VA)	Sutton	Watson
Serrano	Tanner	Watt
Sessions	Tauscher	Waxman
Shadegg	Taylor	Weiner
Shea-Porter	Thompson (CA)	Welch (VT)
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Shuler	Tiahrt	Westmoreland
Shuster	Tiberi	Westmoreland
Sires	Tierney	Wexler
Skelton	Towns	Wilson (NM)
Slaughter	Turner	Wilson (OH)
Smith (NE)	Udall (CO)	Wolf
Smith (NJ)	Udall (NM)	Woolsey
Smith (TX)	Upton	Wu
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Wynn
Snyder	Velázquez	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—11

Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Myrick
Clarke	Higgins	Young (AK)
Cubin	Honda	

□ 1814

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1815

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARDOZA). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Ohio) assumed the chair.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1868. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

## TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. HARMAN:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the “ENERGY STAR” or “Federal Energy Management Program” designation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment is offered by Mr. UPTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. INGLIS and me, and what it would do is deny funds under this appropriations bill if the ENERGY STAR and the Federal Emergency Management program standards are not met.

Mr. Chairman, it takes 18 seconds to switch one incandescent light bulb. If everyone did this, just one, we would save \$8 billion in energy costs, prevent the burning of 30 billion pounds of coal, remove 2 million cars worth of greenhouse gas emissions, and make a big dent in our climate problem.

This amendment has been accepted to every appropriations bill so far, and I would urge its adoption now.

It is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. I would just say that this is a bipartisan amendment. We have been asked to expedite our remarks tonight so we can finish votes later this evening.

The Federal Government is the largest purchaser of light bulbs. This will save \$30 per bulb, hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers every year. It is something that has been adopted on every bill, and I would like to think that we can adopt it by voice again this evening.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HARMAN. Reclaiming my time, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I am quite happy to accept the amendment that is being offered by you and Mr. UPTON.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection. We agree. We accept. Thank you.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to establish

or collect tolls on Interstate 80 in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I will be very brief because I believe the amendment has been agreed to.

My amendment is a simple amendment that says Federal funds cannot be used to establish or collect tolls on Interstate 80 in Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLVER. I am happy to accept the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. And likewise, I accept as well.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the two gentlemen. We will let the process move forward.

This was offered both on behalf of Congressmen PETERSON and ENGLISH.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNTER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to participate in a working group pursuant to the Security and Prosperity Partnership.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of myself and the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

And Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which goes directly to the security of this country, the homeland security of this country, and particularly the border security and the sovereignty of the Nation.

We have right now in Texas a project that is underway, a massive project to build a 12-lane highway heading north, presumably funded largely by private funds, which will head north toward Oklahoma. And the understanding that I have, looking at the statements which have been made by the Security and Prosperity Partnership, is that this is part of an overall plan to develop a corridor between Mexico and Canada transiting the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for this amendment, which strikes the funds for the administration to spend money with discussion teams and working groups on this particular project, is because this is a project which cries out for congressional oversight, of which right now there is none. Now, as a representative of a border State, and having represented all the California-Mexican border at one time, my questions would be: What security matters are being discussed right now with these thousands of new trucks which will be transiting this 12-lane highway? What percent of the trucks will be checked? What transparency will be involved with respect to the driving records, and more importantly, the criminal records of the people behind the wheels of these trucks? What are the plans in place to put together a security apparatus to ensure that we have more than 1 percent or 2 percent of this vehicular trade checked?

Now, this is a working group which is proceeding, which claims that it has no plans to participate in what they call this private program to deliver this 12-lane highway straight across the middle of the United States connecting Mexico and Canada. Yet, in their own description of what they do, they claim that they undertake these working groups to facilitate multimodal corridors and alleviate bottlenecks at the border.

Alleviating bottlenecks at the border, Mr. Chairman, when you only are checking 1 to 2 percent of the cargo containers coming in right now, is a code word for less security, these so-called "fast passes," these passes in which you go through the security apparatus in a matter of seconds rather than in a matter of hours.

So I think that it's time, before they facilitate this multimodal operation, for the administration to consult Congress. It's time for our oversight.

At this point, I would like to yield to the cosponsor of this amendment, the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and in support of the Hunter-Kaptur amendment. It is a simple limitation amendment. And frankly, one of the chief reasons I'm supporting it, in addition to all the excellent reasons Mr. HUNTER has given, is that the administration refuses to report back to Congress its negotiation on this Security and Prosperity Partnership and its impact in a number of areas, including transportation. They have been intransigent, they have been unresponsive and, frankly, they've been secretive. And this is going to have an enormous impact on public welfare across this continent, particularly in our country.

The gentleman talks about security. I support him in that. Right now we've got a situation under NAFTA where so many of our jobs and production platforms have been outsourced to Mexico. We've got all these illegal trucks coming in. They're even making their way

all the way to Ohio, up into Detroit, causing us all kinds of difficulty. We need transparency and we need disclosure about what the Security and Prosperity Partnership is all about. The Administration, even on our request, refuses to answer inquiries about the SPP.

Due to NAFTA, we just have tremendous problems with additional illegal drugs in our area coming in transported in a lot of these vehicles that are coming from the border, and in many ways we already have an unregulated flow across our continent.

So I really support the gentleman's efforts here. We need transparency. We need disclosure. We don't need to expand the difficulties we're already having as a result of what has transpired with NAFTA. And with the size of the roadways that are being talked about, and the possibility they will be privatized tollways, we need to have reporting back from this administration.

So I support the gentleman's amendment very strongly.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I, frankly, am not in favor, and I must oppose this amendment because I think any super-highway between Mexico, the U.S. and Canada, and there are no funds in this bill for this mythical private road, I just don't believe that this super-highway is something that we should get into.

And furthermore, this amendment puts a stop on several transportation-related initiatives between my State, which is Michigan, my city and Canada. For example, we've been working for years to improve the crossing at the Ambassador Bridge between Detroit and Windsor. That's the busiest, it isn't the second busiest, it's the busiest U.S.-Canadian crossing in our country. This amendment would stop years of work and cooperative efforts that we've been working on.

And another example of a cooperative effort under this partnership is aviation. I've got to tell you that there are three international airports in my area, all of which fly into Canada. DOT and Canada are working together to ensure that travel between the two countries is smooth, free and safe.

□ 1830

I would say, free of any burdensome barriers. This amendment would put all of the U.S.-Canada transportation initiatives to an end. That would be detrimental to the Nation.

I think the amendment is one that is a broad brush. It tries to actually focus on one thing, but it is too broad. In fact, it contains some elements that bring about a real problem. I think that they can do much better if they ever redrafted this.

But here is the story. There is no superhighway in this bill. There is not. But there are good initiatives in this bill, ongoing initiatives, that are vital to our country.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to respond to the gentleman from Michigan and say that my district borders Canada too, across Lake Erie. The planes fly over our border, and we go up to Michigan and we take the Ambassador Bridge and so forth up into Canada. So we share those concerns. But what we don't share is our dismay at the lack of transparency that characterizes the Bush administration. What exactly are they discussing with the Government of Canada, with the Government of Mexico and other governments in the Americas?

We have a right to know. We have a right to participate. We want transparency and disclosure on the SPP. Their secretiveness about what is going on is a deep concern. Vote for the Hunter-Kaptur amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the ranking member, it seems to me, makes some very good points. I know how concerned he is about the impact that this might have, that may be unintended consequences in relation to the northern border with a prohibition of this nature. I think we need to be concerned about unintended consequences in which worthwhile activities that we might want to support might be eliminated by it.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly I am going to vote against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is

not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 6.3 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, we had asked unanimous consent earlier and were given unanimous consent that these amendments would be read. I didn't hear the amendment read.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the chairman.

The amendment before you would reduce the appropriations in the bill by \$3.2 billion, as was just read by the Clerk.

Even though the majority party will call this a "cut in spending," this is not a cut. This is simply returning the level of spending in this appropriations bill to last year's level. It is level funding, spending the same dollar amount we spent last year. Again, as I have articulated on this floor several times in the appropriations process on other pieces of legislation, it is exactly what all kinds of families across this country have to do.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the work of the committee. I don't bring this amendment because I don't appreciate the work that the committee does; I bring it because our country and our government do face a real financial challenge in the future. If we don't begin to get a handle on the spending that this Congress does and that our government does, we are going to have real problems.

The best way to begin to start that, when you think about the challenges and problems that loom in front of us, with entitlements, with Social Security, with Medicaid, with Medicare, the way to start that process, to get a handle on the fiscal crisis that is looming, is to start right here and say, you know what? It is probably not too much to ask for the Congress and for the Government of the United States to spend the same amount that they spent last year. That is why I bring this amendment forward.

I would also point out this: Inevitably, when you continue to increase spending and increase spending and increase spending, it always leads to greater taxes. People talk all the time about tax-and-spend politicians. In truth it is just the opposite. It is spend and tax. Spending drives the equation, and that is why we have to focus on spending if we don't want to raise taxes on the American people, which we surely don't want to do.

Yet the other party is talking about doing exactly that. All you have to do is look at recent press clippings where they talked about raising the tobacco

tax to deal with the SCHIP program. They have talked about raising taxes on the top marginal bracket to begin to address the AMT. Both are bad ideas for families, bad ideas for our economy, and not the direction we want to proceed.

Again, I bring this amendment forward because I think it is something that we have to begin to focus on as we look at the financial situation that is just around the corner for this country. All kinds of families, all kinds of taxpayers, all kinds of business owners have to live on last year's spending. It is not too much to ask our government to do the same. It is not too much to ask that our government do exactly what families all across this country have to do.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is an amendment that reduces the overall funding in this legislation by \$3.2 billion, which is the amount of the budget as passed for the 2007 fiscal year by way of the continuing resolution that was passed back in February. In this process we have had a large number of holes in the legislation that had been presented to us by the President for this year, and in his budget was \$2.8 billion under the bill that we had presented here this evening.

In the process there are several items which are very similar and some which are quite different in reaching where we are in this legislation. In particular, the section 8 funding under HUD, we felt that we had to increase the funding for section 8, both for the Tenant-Based Housing Assistance program and for the Project-Based Housing Assistance program, by a substantial sum of money. That is done specifically because there was a change in the CR of the authorizations there for funding vouchers, and in order to make certain that every person had their vouchers and no one was going to lose rental assistance, it was necessary then to add about \$1 billion into tenant-based and project-based assistance in order to meet that and fill that need. That is one of the items.

We had also to very substantially increase the programs in transportation in order to reach the guarantees necessary for meeting SAFETEA-LU, which, of course, the President doesn't really care about.

So those items, which I think everybody in this Congress agrees with, have had to be increased and require that we not reduce the funding under the legislation to the level that has been suggested.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), the Republican Conference Chair.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank my friend for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, let's take a little status report here. This is the eighth appropriations bill that has moved across this floor, which is commendable, since none have moved across the Senate floor. But it is easier to move legislation when there is no bottom line, when there are no constraints, when you can just put any amount of money into the spending bills. This bill marks the eighth step in the progression towards a \$1 trillion fiscal train wreck that is coming this fall because of the inability of the Democratic Congress to adhere to fiscal restraint.

There is a \$23 billion difference between what the Democratic Congress would fund and where the President's request is, something that has been dismissed in their letter to the President as "a mere 1 percent." Well, only in the fantasy land of Washington is \$23 billion pocket change.

□ 1845

It is vitally important that we restore fiscal accountability to Washington, and it begins with amendments like this one offered by my friend from Ohio that says let's just hold what we had last year. This bill proposes to spend almost 7 percent more than last year and almost 6 percent above what the President requested.

But what's the difference between that 1 percent? You say it is 7 and 6 percent. That is the difference between \$2.8 billion and \$3.2 billion. The difference between what this Congress would spend and what the President would spend is larger than most States' budgets that meet all of the needs of that State. This is the first step in this bill's process towards restoring the kind of commonsense fiscal accountability that Americans are starving for.

And when we get down into the weeds of these numbers, people just cloud up because it is so hard to comprehend that a mere 1 percent translates into tens of billions of dollars. But mark my words, ladies and gentlemen, the fiscal train wreck is coming this fall because of the inability of this Democratic-led House to restrain itself from spending billions more than are necessary to meet the needs of this government.

And what that will mean undoubtedly as part of their budget blueprint is higher taxes, taxes that will cripple our economy, taxes that will undo the record low unemployment rate, undo a 14,000 point Dow, undo record homeownership.

Mark my words, a trillion-dollar train wreck is coming if you don't adopt amendments like these.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS).

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my

friend from Ohio for yielding and for his leadership.

I come from the mountains of east Tennessee. We have a lot of common sense in those mountains. We understand when you spend \$3.2 billion, that's a lot of money. We have men and women all around America right now sitting around their kitchen tables trying to decide just exactly how they are going to feed their children, how they are going to take care of their families, how they are going to pay the tuition and buy that next tank of gas.

We talked about in the last election that we are going to be providing a change here in Washington. I believe the freshmen Republicans that came into Congress with me this year are here to offer that change. The way we offer that change is quit spending as much as has been spent in the past. We can do that.

When we have an economy growing about 3 percent and this bill is going to grow by 6 or 7 percent, people understand you can't grow government at twice the rate of the American family's income. It just can't be done. We need to make sure that we use some commonsense when we put these budgets together. We can't spend more money than the American people can earn.

I think the American people did send us here to Washington to rein in that spending, get a handle on our fiscal House. I think this amendment by my friend from Ohio will go a long way towards doing that. This is not about a cut. This is simply about holding the line on spending.

The American people can understand if they have \$100 this year and somebody wants to grow it to \$200 next year but you can't afford it, and you say, "I can't give you \$200, but I will let you keep your \$100," if you kept that at \$100, that is not a cut. That is staying the same. That is what this amendment does. This simply says we are not going to grow that \$3.2 billion.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 12½ minutes. The gentleman from New York has 17 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire, does the gentleman from New York have any additional speakers on the amendment?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that I have the right to close, and I am reserving to close.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, is he intending to close with a 17½ minute speech?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI), a friend and freshman colleague.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as I have walked around the halls of the office buildings for the House. I have noticed the signs that talk about the truth needing to be told regarding the majority's budget that was passed, the claim that while there is no tax increase in that budget, and technically that is true, Mr. Chairman. There is no language in that budget bill that says taxes are raised on anyone in any manner. There is no claim there are additional taxes. That language is not in that budget.

But the effect of that budget, Mr. Chairman, will be increased taxes. Why do I say that? Well, because the majority has been very vocal throughout the last year, through the last campaign season, that by golly, one of the things we need to do is get our spending under control, get this deficit problem under control.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the problem is not taxes at this point. The problem today, though, is the spending, because if the spending continues at the rate we are going, that the majority is proceeding, one of two things has got to happen: Either we have to increase deficit spending or we have to increase taxes to pay for it.

I would just point out that about \$1 in \$5 for the budget last year was deficit spending, so how does the majority intend to avoid deficit spending at the same rate that they criticized last year? And, in fact, how will they avoid increasing that deficit spending by spending more this year unless they intend to increase taxes. At some point that choice has got to be made.

Mr. Chairman, it starts with the spending. If we support this amendment, that will be a start in the right direction.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, because the Democrats are so mesmerized by our presentation, we will continue. It is the first time I have known them to be speechless, but we will continue, and so I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Ohio for his leadership on this bill, and I am happy to come and lend my comments to the discussion.

Last year the Democrats got elected partly on the basis of their promise to cut spending. They made a big to-do about the fact that we were increasing spending. Republicans had done that. This is not cutting spending; this is holding the line on spending.

The eight appropriations bills that have passed the House so far are \$34 billion above last year's spending levels. That is not fulfilling the promises that they made to help hold the line and even cut spending. As my colleagues have said, this inevitably is going to lead to the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

Furthermore, in terms of this bill in particular, I have searched the Constitution and I see no role for the Federal Government in most of what is going to be funded in this bill. But the Democrats have never met a request for spending that they didn't like, and so they are going on willy-nilly increasing spending, putting the American taxpayer at risk, and increasing the deficit in this country; whereas, the tax cuts that were passed in 2001 and 2003 have led us to a very, very strong economy which we know is benefiting the American people right now.

Furthermore, none of the promises that they made about slowing the exploding growth of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid that would result in deficit reduction have been dealt with in this Congress.

We have simply got to come to grips with the fact that we cannot tax the American people to the level at which they are being taxed and the level to which the Democrats want them to be taxed. We have to hold the line on spending, and I support this amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for posing this amendment.

The reason we are here today, Mr. Chairman, is because this is over-budget. Take a look at this bill right here. It is \$2.8 billion above the President's request and includes a \$3.1 billion boost for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. There are also some phony gimmicks in this spending bill.

As noted, the bill provides phony offsets for spending increases by rescinding budget authority with no outlay savings. So what you are doing, you are actually canceling something that doesn't really exist to show paper savings so you can spend it somewhere else. Now, this is an old trick that has been done on both sides of the aisle over the years, but it still doesn't make it right.

The problem we have with this bill, as the preceding bills and the following appropriations bills, is it is \$34 billion above last year's spending level just for what we have passed so far. That is \$19 billion above the President's request. This majority's spending bills are going to be \$81 billion above last year's spending level.

When you look at the budget resolution, this bill does conform to the budget resolution. It meets 302(b). What that means in budget talk is they are conforming to their budget. But what does their budget do? Their budget leads to the largest tax increase in American history.

If you accept these spending increases, which, on average, are 9 percent spending increases for discretionary spending, three times the rate of inflation, three times the rate of



wage growth, three times the ability for families to be able to afford this expense, three times the rate that our family incomes go up at best, if you accept these spending increases, that means you are accepting the plan in the budget, and the plan in the budget is to raise taxes. Not by a little bit, by a lot.

What tax increases are they specifically calling for in the budget resolution that this is a part of? Getting rid of the marriage penalty, bringing it back altogether; reducing the child tax credit in half; raising income tax rates across the board for every single working American and every single working family; bringing the death tax back in full force; raising taxes on capital gains and dividends, which makes it easier for people to save for retirement, and that creates jobs.

So the problem we have here, Mr. Chairman, is not a revenue problem. We have had double-digit revenue increases coming to the Federal Government for the past 3 years in a row.

□ 1900

The deficit just went down this year again by 18 percent because of faster revenue growth. So we don't have the problem with the money coming in. We don't need to raise taxes. Plenty of money is coming in to the coffers of Washington.

The problem we have is spending. We are just spending too much money too quickly. If we want to balance the budget without raising taxes, we have to control spending. That's the lesson we've learned.

Now, what does this bill do? This bill irresponsibly increases spending too fast. Are there important functions that are in this bill? Yes. Are there important things that the government needs to do, roads and bridges and transportation? Yes.

The problem I have with this bill is it doesn't have fiscal discipline. It doesn't contain a budget cap that makes sure we won't raise taxes.

So, by subscribing to the budget increases, the spending increases in the bill and the appropriations bills before it and the ones that are yet to come, it puts us on that glide path, on that trajectory to having the largest tax increase in American history. We don't want those taxes to be increased, and we sure don't want to support budgets that put us on the path to making it a sure thing, and that, Mr. Chairman, is why I think we should vote against this.

I think we should also have better budgeting. I don't think we should be rescinding phony budget authority to then use it for outlays. So, if we get rid of the gimmicks, this thing wouldn't even comport with the budget resolution itself.

So with that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask how much time is left.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 17 minutes.

The gentleman from Ohio has 4½ minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that there is no tax increase in this bill. The other side, Mr. Chairman, they went from saying that there is a tax increase to that this may put us on a trajectory to a tax increase, could be, possibly.

There is no tax increase in this bill. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, just a few comments before we use the remaining few minutes of our time as well.

Think about this. The ranking member of the Budget Committee pointed out the facts, what's in this bill, the numbers, the budget, and what's going on. But it's always important to come back and focus on how that translates into the lives of the American people and American families.

I think it's important just to remember and think about the typical family across this country. They go to work each day. They go to church on Sunday. They make their house payment. They make their car payment. Maybe they're paying their kids' private school. They're saving for college. They may be saving for a family vacation. They don't get an automatic 7 percent, in this particular bill \$3.2 billion, increase. They don't get that. They have to budget. They have to learn to live on less many times.

And that's all this amendment says is, you know what, let's just spend exactly what we spent last year, because if we don't. And we keep on this spending train that we're on, there will be tax increases. And then that family I just described, it's going to be tougher for them to pay for that vacation, pay for their kids' school, pay for the shoes for soccer practice and Little League and pay for all those things that families have to pay for. That's why this is important.

It begins to put us on the path to deal with the problems that are certainly going to be there if we don't start getting a handle on spending. That's why I bring the amendment forward. That's what all our speakers have talked about, because it's that important that we begin to do the right thing here.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio have any further speakers?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. You do.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the chairman.

Has the gentleman yielded back his time?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. The question from the Chair was do we have additional speakers. My response was no.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Is the gentleman from New York the only speaker?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I am the final speaker, and I have the right to close.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Then I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, this is like a soap opera. It doesn't matter when the American people tune it in, turn it on, it's the same script, the same characters, the same plot, the dialogue.

Every week this small group of Members tries to offer these amendments, and every week they're defeated, defeated by the members of their own caucus.

This appropriations bill was passed by the Appropriations Committee on a bipartisan basis. Democrats and Republicans supported this bill because it has the right investments for the American family.

They support the notion that we should make sure that we have children in car seats that are safe. The gentleman's amendment would cut funding for car seat safety for our children.

They support the notion that we should make sure that our highways are safe. The gentleman's amendment would cut funding for highway safety.

They support the notion, Republicans and Democrats alike, that when you go to the airport, there should be enough inspectors to make sure that your plane is safe. The gentleman's amendment would cut the number of inspectors for airlines and increase delays at airports.

Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee alike agreed with the notion that elderly people who worked hard, raised their families, paid their dues should have a chance, a better chance, to get decent housing. The gentleman's amendment would cut that chance of decent housing for the elderly.

And Republicans and Democrats alike, who share commonsense values and compassion, also agree that if you're disabled, you should have a chance to get some decent housing. The gentleman's amendment would cut the chance of getting decent housing if you are disabled.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman talked about the common family and the values that they have. Let me suggest to the gentleman one thing, and then I will close.

This isn't really about the argument that the gentleman uses that we should cut spending. With all due respect, the gentleman was nowhere around when we spent and spent and spent and borrowed and borrowed and borrowed for special interests. I will talk about the typical American family.

This morning on the front page of the newspaper there was a story about how

huge tax breaks that some on the other side supported for the largest multinational corporations on Earth, that were promised to create jobs, did the opposite. Two years ago, according to the newspaper, when companies received a big tax break to bring home their offshore profits, the President and Congress justified it as a one-time tax amnesty that would create American jobs, but the companies did not create many jobs in return. Instead, since 2005, the American drug industry has laid off tens of thousands of workers in this country.

And so let's close by returning to that family. The gentleman may have a family in his district, a Jones family. Mr. Jones worked for one of those big multinational corporations that have a P.O. box in Bermuda to escape their fair share of taxes at home. Mr. Jones thought that that tax break to that big company was going to save his job. The company got the tax breaks. He got a pink slip.

Now, if that's not bad enough, the gentleman would propose that Mr. Jones, when he goes on the highway to try and find another job, that he's less safe; that Mrs. Jones, who's working at the Wal-Mart, when she straps her daughter into a car seat, that that car seat be less safe because of the cuts to those programs; if the Joneses have enough money to scrimp and save and maybe visit their parents or grandparents in another State, that they wait even longer to get on the plane, and that the plane not have the inspection as quickly as it needs to; and that if Mr. Jones' and Mrs. Jones' parents or grandparents want to have a decent roof over their heads, that they have to wait longer, in fact may not even qualify, because of the cuts in housing assistance for the elderly and the disabled.

The difference between us is that we want to invest in the American family, and the other side, not everybody on the other side, Republicans and Democrats alike, on a bipartisan basis, passed this bill to invest in the American family.

The sponsor of this amendment wants to continue giving giveaways to the richest special interests. We believe those funds are better spent with the American family.

That's what this is about, and that's why I'm so proud that Republicans and Democrats alike supported this bill in the Appropriations Committee and will defeat this amendment when it comes to the floor later.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$507,767,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair, and I thank the leadership for the opportunity to bring this amendment forward.

This amendment is a very simple amendment. It's an amendment that has come to be known as the Hefley amendment, or at least came to be known as the Hefley amendment, a former Member of this body who offered an amendment to decrease appropriations bills by 1 percent in an effort to begin fiscal responsibility.

And it's my privilege to bring these amendments to the floor again in an effort to take that first step, take that first step to begin fiscal responsibility in this Chamber.

This is a good debate. It's a good debate that we have when we talk about how to spend hard-earned taxpayer money, because, Mr. Chairman, as you know, oftentimes in this Chamber, in fact, we've heard on some of these appropriations bills Members talk about their money, about my money. And it's always important that we remember whose money it is. It's not government money. It's not our money. It's the money of the hardworking American taxpayer.

So this amendment is very simple. It simply says that we ought to reduce by 1 percent the amount of money being spent in this particular appropriations bill. And to be clear, that is still a significant increase in spending over last year, but it's an attempt to begin fiscal responsibility.

One of the numbers, the numbers are that last year this portion of the appropriations bill spent \$47.5 billion. The President requested an increase to \$47.9 billion for this next fiscal year, and the committee itself brings forward a bill that will spend \$50.7 billion. That's \$3.2 billion more than last year.

So this amendment would say, well, we ought not spend \$50.7 billion. Let's see if we can't get a little fiscal responsibility and instead spend \$50.2 billion.

Again, it's not as far as many of us think we ought to go in an effort to try

to be more responsible with spending the hard-earned American taxpayers' money, but it is a step in the right direction. It is a step along the line of fiscal responsibility. It is a recognition. It would be the beginning of a recognition that this is not Congress's money, that it is the money of the hardworking American taxpayer.

On many of these bills we seem to get a few more votes each time. I'm hopeful that at some point this House will make a statement, that this House will make a statement and say, yes, we do believe that, in fact, moving forward under the banner of fiscal responsibility dictates that we respect the hard work of the American taxpayer and, in fact, accept one of these amendments as we move forward.

So with that I think it's a common-sense amendment. It's a problem-solving amendment. It's an amendment that speaks to what the American family would do when they have some fiscal challenges, and that is to overall reduce the amount of money that they spend.

So, with that, I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague Dr. PRICE for offering this amendment. Certainly the American people can relate to this amendment. It simply says that we will not spend 1 percent of the bill as currently written, 1 percent. Well, that equates to \$500 million, a substantial sum of money even in the context of the Federal budget.

What we have in Washington, D.C., is a spending problem. We don't have a problem with income to government. The government will receive about \$2.7 trillion this year on a Federal budget that actually spends \$2.9 trillion.

□ 1915

What is absolutely fascinating about this is that there are only two countries on Earth with whole economies that are larger than the Federal Government here in Washington, D.C., and that is the governments of Germany and Japan. When we talk about China and the growing threat of China's economy, well, look at the size of the Chinese economy. The whole economy of China is \$1.9 trillion. What we have here in Washington D.C. is certainly a spending problem.

What this amendment proposed by Dr. PRICE says is that we should be able to slip off just a little bit of that spending, just a little bit, show the American taxpayers that we can tighten the

belt just ever so slightly, which means, instead of eating that whole cake, which is what the Democrat leadership proposes for dessert, eating that whole cake, we are just going to take off just a little bit of the icing, just a taste of the icing, rather than eating that whole cake.

Now, certainly we can do that. Certainly the American people understand the Federal Government could save 1 percent. Every family budget across America can save 1 percent.

I urge my colleagues, even the liberal Democrats on the other side of the aisle, my friends from the other side of the aisle who said that we want to spend more and more and more. They certainly can say we will, when we are increasing spending so rapidly, what the Democrats are doing here, we could say that just 1 percent, we will take off 1 percent right off the top.

So I urge my colleagues to support this reasonable and commonsense measure that shows some level of restraint, even with bloated Democrat spending in Washington, D.C.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire whether it's the intention of the gentleman from Ohio to close when he speaks.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is my intention. I am the final speaker.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding the time and for bringing up this amendment.

Each time he does, of course, I am reminded of our former colleague, our great friend, Joel Hefley from Colorado who brought this amendment up in past Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't understand, perhaps I would have to admit, the full significance and importance of what he was trying to do, and that was just to, in a very, very, very modest way, curtail the spending spree that we have here in Washington, that spending spree that our friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, was just explaining.

Of course, this is a modest effort, 1 percent on one spending bill. We know that the real issue here in Washington is the explosion in entitlement spending. The gentleman from New York earlier said that there was no tax increase in this bill. Of course, we understand that. This isn't a tax bill; this is a spending bill.

But it is tied to a budget, to a budget that significantly did one thing: it brought us the largest tax increase in American history. Yes, that tax increase won't hit in a significant way in this year, but in order to make that budget balance, it was necessary to bring us the largest tax increase in American history so that by the end of the budget period, the budget could balance.

The other thing that budget had, or, more significantly, did not have, it didn't have anything to constrain entitlement spending. Well, it did. It had a small piece, a very small piece, where there was an effort to save less than \$1 billion in entitlement spending; and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle stepped up to the plate to save that less than \$1 billion and created nine new entitlement spending programs.

We do have a spending problem here, and that is followed by an enormous taxing problem. This is a spend-and-tax issue that I think the American people can understand. Their budgets aren't growing by 7 percent. The Federal Government is growing its spending by more than that. This effort by my good friend from Georgia is, indeed, a modest effort.

This is a tiny, let's save one penny, one penny on the dollar that this spending bill has. We can't seem to find a way to save that one penny, and yet we are letting entitlement spending grow by trillions of dollars.

I think the American people are going to grow increasingly aware that we have an unfunded liability in entitlement spending of trillions and trillions of dollars, well over \$50 trillion.

So this is a modest effort, but I would call on my colleagues to take this tiny step that Mr. Hefley brought us in the past and that my colleague, Mr. PRICE, has brought us here.

Let's support the amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I just wanted to respond to the gentleman who had just spoken.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has mentioned twice in the comments that he has made, at least twice in the comments, that, again, the idea that this budget that we are dealing with has somehow inherent in it the largest tax increase in American history, twice he has made that comment.

Well, the budget that we are dealing with has no increase in taxes whatsoever related to it. I think the gentleman understands that. In fact, even the budget resolution that guides the budgeting this year for all of our bills, all of our discretionary budget legislation, that budget resolution does not have any tax increase in it either. I think the gentleman understands that as well.

We are making messages here that are really not correct. They are simply not accurate. They are simply not true.

I want to make a couple of points. I want to remind the gentleman and others from the other side who have spoken that since President Bush took office, the national debt has increased by over \$3 trillion, \$3 trillion, over 3, it's closer to \$3.3 trillion. That's 3 with 12 zeros behind it.

Some people have a difficult time understanding a three with six zeros be-

hind it. That's \$1 million. But \$3 trillion, with 12 zeros behind it is \$1 million, million dollars.

That debt increase of \$3 trillion that has occurred in the 6 years that President Bush has been in power in the Presidency, that ends up costing us, the American people, us as a Nation, \$100 billion each and every year in additional deficit, which is what has happened, an additional deficit, every year \$100 billion each year, which is some 200 times the amount of money that is being suggested ought to be cut from this one little budget that we are talking about that provides money for a whole series of very important initiatives that serve the American people.

To close, I could go on substantially on the debt, but the \$500 million that has been suggested that should be cut from this budget, this one simple budget that funds housing and transportation programs of the government, this one budget, if one compares the \$500 million, that two pieces of the budget, the \$500 million is essentially the same money that we had to put back in the budget because Amtrak would have shut down.

\$500 million is about the same amount of money as was put into that. It is about one half of the money that was put back in to make certain that not a single family, low-income family, people who are living with incomes of under 30 percent of the adjusted median income in their areas, one half of the amount of money that would allow all of those people who had vouchers and who are getting rental assistance, in that very low-income category, to maintain their vouchers for the next year.

It is also a sum of money which is somewhat less than the amount that we had to put back into the budget to bring it up to these levels, to the 2007 enacted level at \$700 million, or the Community Development Block Grant program, which provides money to virtually every community in the country, larger cities, by direct distribution from the Federal Government through Housing and Urban Development, but also to many smaller cities and communities, even quite small communities, through the money that's distributed to the States who then give it back to those communities in order to build affordable housing and build public facilities in their communities.

It is very close to the amount of money that is included in this budget and provides for the construction of elder housing, housing for the disabled and housing for distressed public housing as well.

So that is what is involved in \$500 million at this point. I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) for purposes of setting the record straight.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time. I appreciate that because I would like

to respond to the gentleman from Massachusetts on just a couple of points.

One, we had a number of discussions on zeros and what that means when we talk about the debt, nine zeros, 12 zero, six zeros, I would say there are a lot of American families that are concerned about five zeros and what the impact of the tax increase is going to have on that.

With all respect to my friend from Massachusetts, the Democrat budget does have the largest tax increase in American history. In order to make that budget balance, all of the tax relief which we have worked so hard to achieve in the last few years, and which is behind the growth and the economy, all that would go away, tax relief for married families, tax relief for every American worker who pays taxes. All that's erased in the Democrat's budget that is behind this spending bill that we are in today.

I think he helps me make the point that this is, when he talks about trillions of dollars, that this bill, that this amendment is a very modest step in curtailing that spending.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire as to the amount of time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio has 20 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, this budget proposal isn't a real surprise; it's business as usual for the Democrats and proves that their promises to be fiscally responsible are just empty rhetoric. If this budget, along with the other budgets that we have been approving, are approved, it signals a return to the Democrats' beloved tax-and-spend model for government. They are very happy to try to run the lives of all Americans from the Federal level.

The 2001 and 2003 tax cuts have produced a real decrease in the tax burden on North Carolina's married couples, single parents, and families. Almost every taxpayer, low-income, married, single or self-employed, will lose valuable tax cuts under the assumptions made in the Democrat budget proposal earlier this year, and that would cover the costs that are in this budget tonight.

The economy is booming. The stock market is doing great. People's 401(k) plans are increasing tremendously. But they want to stop that because they want to spend your money. They think they know better how to spend your money than you know how to spend your money.

The Federal Government doesn't have a revenue problem. Revenues increased by 14.5 percent in 2005, 11.6 percent in 2006, and they are projected to grow by an additional \$167 billion, or 7

percent, this year, according to the latest OMB estimate.

Again, the economy is booming, things are going great, but the Democrats would put a halt on that with their profligate spending. To put it another way, the Federal Government is projected to collect \$800 billion more in revenue in 2007 than was just the case 4 years ago, \$2.6 trillion in 2007 compared to \$1.8 trillion in 2003.

□ 1930

We need to slow down spending and allow the American people to keep more of their money. They know how to spend it better than Federal bureaucrats do.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLIVER).

Mr. OLIVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I just want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that the absolute platinum standard for fiscal irresponsibility lies squarely on the shoulders of her party and the Presidents of her party.

The national debt for this country when President Carter left office in 1981 was less than \$1 trillion. The national debt 12 years later, in the case of President Carter, that represents the debt that had been reached over 180 years of American history. Twelve years later, the national debt when the first President Bush left office was \$4.3 trillion, more than four times as much, more than quadrupling the total national debt. That is the gold standard of fiscal irresponsibility.

And then we had 8 years of President Clinton, and the national debt went up another \$1.2 trillion, about a 25 percent increase in the national debt in the 8 years that he was President.

But then, under the present President Bush and the Congress of his party in control during those years, the national debt has gone up \$3.3 trillion more, a total of about two-thirds more, 67 or 68 percent more in debt. That is the platinum standard in debt increase and in fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend from Texas, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must admit, every time I come to the floor and a Democrat lectures me on fiscal responsibility, I feel like I am having an Alice in Wonderland experience; and that is because the deficit is the symptom, it is spending that is the disease. And so we have Democrats come to the floor and say, well, when you Republicans were in power, you spent too much. Well, some of us Republicans agree. So what is your answer, Mr. Chairman? Well, they want to spend even more.

For the last 10 years, look at the record. Every time the Republicans offer one budget, the Democrats offer a

budget that spends even more. And then they say it is fiscally irresponsible that the national debt went up from \$5 trillion to \$8 trillion. I don't like that a bit. But, guess what? Because the Democrats' budget was stone cold silent on entitlement spending, the national debt unfunded obligations is \$50 trillion. So I will be glad to accept responsibility for \$3 trillion when my friends on the other side of the aisle accept responsibility for their \$50 trillion.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I continue to reserve my right to close.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to ask my good friend from Ohio whether it is the final right to close, or whether it is otherwise.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I will continue to reserve my right to close, unless my chairman wants more time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I like us being pleasant with each other.

I think this is a fascinating debate and an important debate, and, quite frankly, I have watched it unfold over the bills earlier this year. And the reality is, in Washington, nobody has the high ground on spending.

When I and my colleagues as fiscal conservatives get up on this side and say cut spending, as we are in this amendment by a mere 1 percent, it is absolutely fair and absolutely true for my colleagues to get up on the other side, as they have done and done well, and lecture us about spending. You guys are the, to use the words a moment ago, platinum standard on spending. And in many ways they are absolutely right.

I note with chagrin that because neither Republicans nor Democrats have the high ground on spending, something has to be done, and I would suggest at some point we have to begin. Maybe it is with this amendment, maybe it is not with this amendment, maybe it is with something else. But let's talk about spending.

On our watch, on the Republicans' watch, family income grew from 1995 to 2004 by 8.2 percent. Pretty good. Not bad. We could all wish it had been better. But what did Republicans do on spending? Republicans grew Federal outlays by a staggering 25 percent. You are right, we don't have much high ground to talk about. But when, then, will we start? And who will it be that starts?

Your side of the aisle encouraged the American people by saying, JAMES CLYBURN, Democratic House chairman, said in a press release on October 10, 2006: "Democrats offer a new direction which includes fiscal responsibility."

Speaker-elect NANCY PELOSI in a press release November 16 said: "We will work together to lead the House of Representatives with a commitment to integrity, to civility, which we have

seen a little bit of tonight, and to fiscal responsibility."

And Majority Leader STENY HOYER said: "It is imperative to the future of our Nation, and I agree with him, that we come together, Democrats and Republicans, and restore fiscal responsibility."

There are some hard facts that both sides have to deal with. Those hard facts include: As we stand here debating this bill, it will increase spending by 6.7 percent over last year, this particular bill. That is nearly three times the rate of inflation. It might be less than Republicans grew the spending in some occasions; but nonetheless, if we keep growing spending at three times the rate of inflation, we will double the size of this government in a short 10 years.

I would simply suggest that neither Republicans nor Democrats can defend putting that kind of a tax burden on our economy and on our taxpayers and sustain it. And I would suggest that the respected leaders of the Democrats' party, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, acknowledged that when they said it is time to restore fiscal responsibility.

This kind of an explosion in Federal spending is simply not sustainable. Now, I have listened to my colleagues on the other side say, well, you guys spend in this area or that area. Now you want to cut here. You come in and say, we spent in an inappropriate way on, call it corporate subsidies, call it tax giveaways, whatever it is. So be it. That is fair criticism, too.

But the question I think that presents itself to all of us, Republican and Democrats alike, is: When do we reduce spending?

If you don't want to reduce spending on this bill by 1 percent or on the next amendment by one-half percent, then where are we going to cut spending? Because at the end of the day, this economy, I do not believe, will sustain, whether it is driven by Republicans or Democrats, a continued growth of three times the rate of inflation.

The average American gets by without anywhere near that kind of an increase in their spending. The average American's budget doesn't double in that short a period of time. It doesn't go up by 6.7 percent per year. And it seems to me, whether it is on your watch on this bill, on your watch on a different bill, or on our watch someday down the line, we have got to rein in government spending, or we will cripple this economy. And if you want to change the priorities and spend in different places, that is your right. You are the majority. But somebody, whether it is you or whether it is us, has got to reduce the level of spending, because it simply isn't sustainable.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes; the gentleman from Ohio has 18 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the chairman.

I think this has been a healthy presentation from this side. The muted response from the other side is understandable.

When you have instituted in your budget the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation, when you continue to increase the spending at a rate that is greater than inflation, greater than the increase in population for our Nation, then the response, I suspect, ought to be muted.

My good friend from Ohio has said he will close, and I look forward to that response. I am reminded, prior to him standing up, though, that a wise individual once said: When you don't have the facts on your side, then you ought to raise your voice, and you ought to raise it very loud. And so I ask my colleagues to pay attention to what is about to come.

I do want to recognize what my good friend from Texas said, though, and that was talk about Alice in Wonderland. I have dubbed it Orwellian democracy that we are involved in here. My friend from Massachusetts talks about the railing against the Republicans who spent too much and increased the debt. And so what is the response to that? It is to increase it even further, spend more money. They use the grand line of we are interested in investing in the American family. Well, Mr. Chairman, the American families all across this Nation know that when the majority party, when the Democrats talk about investing, what they mean is to hold on to your wallet because that means that taxes are coming; and the budget indeed includes the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation.

This bill, this bill in and of itself, a \$3.2 billion increase, 6.7 percent over last year. Why is it that we can't just decrease that by 1 percent? By 1 percent. Is that too much to ask?

Mr. Chairman, I would urge you, if you have any questions about what kinds of money we are talking about, it is H.R. 3074, you can go on line. You can find this bill on line, and you can go to any line item. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, when you do that, that if you take any specific line item and you say to yourself, is it possible that they might be able to get by with 1 percent less, 1 penny out of a dollar, \$1 out of every \$100? Again, that is what American families all across this Nation do. When they find themselves in a little bit of financial difficulty, when they find that their wallet is a little pinched, what they do is they look at their expenditures and they say, we are going to have to cut back. And that is exactly what we, the American family, want to do is to cut back.

That is what this is. This is a sincere and a commonsense attempt to try to begin fiscal responsibility here in the House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his fine arguments, and all of the gentlemen and ladies who have made their presentation here tonight. And I would also like to thank the Appropriations Committee for the Transportation and HUD bill. This was passed out of committee in a bipartisan way unanimously with Democrats and Republicans. So, again, we come to the floor to have a discussion with a very small group of fringe Members from the other side, Mr. Chairman, so that we can continue to get fiscal responsibility lectures from the Republican Party.

Now, getting lectures on fiscal responsibility from the Republican Party is like getting lectures on animal welfare from Michael Vick. It really doesn't have any credibility. It really doesn't have any credibility.

So we need to look at what the two different approaches here. And I am not going to be long because we have a lot of votes tonight, and we want to get the Members out of here as soon as possible.

There is a difference in philosophy, and the bottom line is this: There are certain things that individual members of our society cannot do. One of them is build a road. Another is build a bridge. And others that we have already had discussions about are going to college and being able to afford college and making sure some families have loans to go to college. And that is what we are here for. That is what we are here for. We are here to do the things that individual citizens cannot do for themselves, and that is what is included in this bill.

We have had talks about trillion-dollar train wrecks coming up, and I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona stating the fact that, yes, the party in power over the past 6 years, \$3 trillion was borrowed primarily from China, Japan, and OPEC countries.

□ 1945

And our friends on the other side had to go to the Treasury Department and ask for the debt limit to be raised so that they could go out and borrow more money. So the lectures have all been given and we've heard them, and we'll probably hear them again later this week and we'll probably hear them again next week.

One of the Members mentioned entitlement spending. It was the Republican Party, Mr. Chairman, who passed the largest increase in entitlement spending with the Medicare part D. And you want to talk about fiscal irresponsibility; they passed it without even giving the Secretary of Health and Human Services the ability to negotiate down the drug prices. That is the platinum standard for fiscal irresponsibility.

So we move forward. What would this cut do? What would this 1 percent cut?

And as the gentleman from New York stated earlier a few of the programs, I think it's important that the Members

know what exactly is going to be cut here. Safety belt performance grants, going to be cut. Occupant protection incentive grants, going to be cut. State traffic safety information system improvement grants, going to be cut. All of the investments in future growth.

In aviation, the inspectors, the budget for inspectors in aviation for this country will be cut under this amendment. There will be less inspectors inspecting the maintenance of our airplanes than there would normally be if this amendment doesn't pass.

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development programs. Airport safety grants under this amendment will be cut. There'll be less money for airports. \$6.9 billion in this bill for air traffic services. That will be cut.

Continue on. Rail, passenger rail grants, those will be cut. Improvement and safety grants, those will be cut.

This is the kicker. Housing for the elderly. That will be cut under this amendment. Housing for the elderly will be cut under this amendment.

And we don't say that these are going to be cuts just because they're going to be cuts, and we're not saying we're spending money on these programs just to spend money. This is the difference.

I think this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very simple and it sounds good. Why can't we just cut 1 percent across the top of this budget?

There's changes going on in the world that make it a little more complex than we would normally think it is. I'll give you some examples. Traveling on our Nation's highways has grown by 94 percent from 1980 to 2005, from 1.5 trillion miles to 3 trillion miles. Of course you're going to need to spend a little bit more money if you have more people on the roads and you have more roads.

Now, the congestion has resulted in 2.3 billion extra gallons of fuel being burnt. That means \$794 per commuter. Now, there's no way a commuter can get the \$300 tax cut that they got a few years ago and go out and somehow fix the congestion problem. There's no way to do that.

We had this same discussion with brownfields. An individual citizen can't clean up a brownfield. You need the Federal investment.

And when you're talking about elderly housing, the elderly population in the United States, Mr. Chairman, is going to grow over the next 25 years by millions and millions and millions of seniors, so it's important that we make these investments.

Another program that will be cut is housing for the disabled. 49.7 million Americans live with a disability. Forty-three percent of those are women. Forty percent of men 65 and older have disabilities. If they had the money to pay for it themselves, they would pay for it and we wouldn't need to be here.

We're making these bipartisan investments, Republicans and Democrats, on the Appropriations Com-

mittee to help move the country forward. And one of the key approaches that we've had when we started this year, under the leadership of Chairman OBEY, is to figure out what the world's going to look like in 10 years so that the investments we make today will have our society ready to compete in the global economy 10 years from now, 20 years from now.

And the bottom line is, this bill here reflects the values of this country, passed by Democrats and Republicans in the committee. And those 1 percent cuts may not mean a whole lot to me, may not mean a whole lot to the chairman, but if you're an adult with a disability, elderly senior, if you're a disabled citizen of this country, if you use the aviation system.

How do you fix the aviation system by yourself? You need to do that together, and that's the investment that we make here. So I appreciate the difference in philosophy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$253,690,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, we've had an interesting discussion here tonight. I am offering an amendment that would propose to reduce the amount by one-half of 1 percent, a mere 50 cents on \$100.

As we look at this appropriations bill, this is \$3.2 billion over last year, or a 6.7 percent increase. My amendment would take it to a 6.2 percent increase.

As we think about this, I hear many things from my friends on the other side of the aisle about "investments." You can use that word euphemistically when we talk about investments, be-

cause what I'm thinking when I hear that word is tax increase on the American family.

We hear many worthy things that this money will be spent for, but there is a philosophical difference in this chamber. And as my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, talk about us being fringe Members over here, what they're acknowledging is that we were not part of the spending problem for our party. We were the folks in the back of the room raising our hand and saying, we are spending too much money.

We do not have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem. As we've seen in recent years under different Presidents and different Congresses, when we lower the tax rate, the revenues increase. So we don't have a revenue problem. What we have is this spending problem.

But my friends on the other side of the aisle, as they spoke tonight, Mr. Chairman, they talked about the needs of disabled people and elderly people and safety and highway issues and air travel, but what we have to admit in this Chamber tonight is that there is a finite amount of money, Mr. Chairman. And it doesn't matter how worthy the spending is. There is a finite amount of money.

When individuals in this country get up in the morning, get their children ready for school and then they go off to work, they realize that they have to work a long portion of the year to pay their taxes. And every time we have another appropriation bill in front of us, we're getting to the point in this Chamber where it's nearly \$82 billion over last year's spending. And the American family knows that they're going to have to work longer in the year before they work long enough to pay their taxes, Mr. Chairman. And I think no matter how worthy the spending is, we need to exercise some fiscal discipline.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have said it half jokingly, but referred to us as fringe Members of Congress. And I have to tell you, sometimes we have to be tenacious about reminding our colleagues how we're going down a road where we're going to have that fiscal train wreck. And I am happy to offer this modest proposal tonight to cut this increase, to lower the increase from 6.7 to 6.2 percent increase and exercise the fiscal discipline that I truly believe the American families, the citizens of this country that pay these taxes want us to have.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman oppose the amendment?

Mr. SCHIFF. Yes, I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the chairman of the committee for his superb work on



the bill and the chairman of the full committee, as well as the subcommittee.

I'm going to reserve the balance of my time, but I do want to acknowledge what the gentlelady has said before reserving the balance of our time, and that is, there is a deep philosophical difference between the Members of the minority party who are here today and those of us speaking in opposition to the amendment. And of course there's a philosophical difference between the Members that are here on the floor today and their fellow Republicans in committee who unanimously supported this bill, those Republicans on the committee and in the House as a whole who have made every effort to work with Democrats and find common ground in dealing with the fiscal challenges that we face, but also recognizing the need to invest in America as our parents' generation did and as their parents did.

Yes, there's a philosophical difference. We're facing a constrained fiscal environment. We've got to get our budget in balance. Some here on the floor tonight we'll hear say, well, we can afford to balance that budget by taking it out of funds for the elderly or taking it out of funds for the homeless, taking it out of funds that help serve Native Americans, taking it out of funds that would make our aircraft more safe.

That's a philosophical difference, I think, with a bipartisan majority of this House that thinks that those aren't the right places to find savings, that we ought to look elsewhere. We ought to look, for example, at the generous corporate welfare payments that we make at a time when the oil industry, for example, has not only had record profits of the year or record profits of the decade, but record profits in the entire history of the oil industry. And not just the history of the oil industry, but record profits of any corporation at any time in the history of the world.

Now, that corporate welfare, my friends on the philosophical other side of this issue don't want to touch. That's sacrosanct. They won't cut those historic profits by 6 percent, or by 1 percent or even by a half of one percent because that's contrary to the philosophy. But they're more than willing to cut those who are desperately in need. And that's where we do have the divide. It's what I will be addressing when I conclude the remarks on our side of the aisle.

But at this point, I will reserve the balance of our time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 4 minutes to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I recall last term in the 109th Congress in the Budget Committee where I served the gentleman from Minnesota who's no longer with us, Mr. Gutknecht, who made a point with regard to spending by this House

and Washington, D.C. You know, in that committee you could always put up charts on the wall with regard to spending, chart A on mandatory spending or B on discretionary spending or health care or other spending. You would put them all up there. And Gil one time went through all the charts and he said, now, can you put up the chart of all the people and lobbyists that come down to Washington to ask for a reduction in their program and spending? And of course they put up a blank screen. Of course, Gil's point was, no one ever comes to Washington, no lobbyist ever comes before the House or committee and says that their program should see a flatlining or a reduction in their programs. And that's really the point here tonight, and it has been all last week.

We are here to set the priorities because everyone that comes to every Member of Congress looks for us to spend more on them, and so we must set priorities because they won't do it for us. So just as the American family has to set priorities, we do. Just as the American family says, we're not going to buy a cable TV system and a Dish TV system and a satellite TV system, we're going to set priorities, pick one if we can afford it. Maybe we can't afford it at all. And when it comes to heating our house, we're not going to have electric heat and hot water heat and coal heat and gas heat. We're going to pick one, hopefully the most efficient. That's what families do. And we would hope that Congress does the exact same thing with the money. Set priorities.

And this amendment really just calls us on doing that, looking to see, not a 6.7 percent increase but a 6.2 percent increase and try to set priorities.

□ 2000

Now, the other side of the aisle says, well, we are being stingy with all these programs if we are not able to go up by a 6.7 percent increase.

I would suggest to the other side of the aisle maybe they are not looking at the right side of the ledger, the right side of the equation. Look at the families who have to pay for all these inefficient, duplicative, and unnecessary programs that they want to spend taxpayer dollars on. Look instead at the American family when it comes to education.

When it comes to education, well, if they do successfully pass the largest tax increase in U.S. history, which they are about to do, the American family is going to have to see their educational spending cut. The American family is going to have to decide whether they can send all of their children to college or not.

The other side should look at the issue of health care for the American family because what they want to do is tell the American taxpayer, you have to cut your spending on health care. Maybe you have a child that needs new braces or glasses or something like that. Well, with their tax increases, the

American family is asked to cut their spending.

How about housing? The other side of the aisle would say the same thing. Maybe it is a young family trying to start off to save enough money to buy their first house. Well, the other side of the aisle would like to raise their taxes on them so that they can put these duplicative programs through, and they will not be able to afford their housing.

Finally, most importantly, after the other side puts on all these burdens when it comes to cutting the taxpayer with regard to education or health care or housing, the biggest burden is on time. When the Democrats raise the largest tax increase in American history on the American family, what they are also doing is taking away time from the American family because now families which weren't working two jobs now have to work two jobs. Families that weren't working overtime before now have to work overtime just to pay for the extra burden that this government in Washington, under Democrat leadership, is imposing on them.

So the most basic thing we could all look for, time with our family, is being robbed, is being taxed, is being taken away from the American family just so we can implement what the Democrats see as necessary, but truthfully we have shown are not priorities, truthfully are unnecessary, duplicative, hugely increased, inefficient programs.

Let's focus again back on the American family. Let's focus again back on allowing them to have time with their family and put the burden where it should be.

I support this amendment and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do so as well.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I have heard many interesting things from the other side of the aisle tonight. I am reminded that people are entitled to their own opinions, but they shouldn't be entitled to their own facts.

I hear a lot of accusations that we have amendments tonight that cut Federal spending. I kind of wish it were true. But last I looked, we had an amendment that level-funded this bill, that spent the same amount of money this year as last year. Now we had an amendment that would increase funding in this bill 5.7 percent. Now we have an amendment that would increase spending up to 6.2 percent. Now, it is less than what the gentleman from Massachusetts desires, and so I guess under his definition that if you spend less money than somebody in the universe desires, that is a cut. So I think, one, we ought to have the facts on the table.

Second of all, I have heard many Democrats bristle at the idea that

their budget resolution included the single largest tax increase in American history. Well, don't take my word for it, Mr. Chairman. The Washington Post, not exactly known as the leading conservative publication in America, wrote: "And while House Democrats say they want to preserve key parts of Bush's signature tax cuts, they project a surplus in 2012 only by assuming that all these cuts expire on schedule in 2010." Now, that is the Washington Post, which most people view as one of the more liberal newspapers in America. That's what they say.

Now, my friends from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, may say we are not raising taxes; we are just letting tax cuts expire. Well, Mr. Chairman, if you have the same salary or wage next year as you had last year, but somehow your tax burden is greater, I can tell you this much: Anybody in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas is going to call that a tax increase.

Now, something that my friends from the other side of the aisle don't seem to get, because they say that we need money for housing, we need money for transportation, we need money for that, there is another budget in America that funds housing, that funds transportation. Mr. Chairman, that is the family budget. And the only budget that is being cut tonight is the American family budget, and it is being cut by Democrat colleagues.

I talk to a lot of hard-working people in my congressional district, in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, and I hear from them because more spending like what is included in this bill fuels more taxes, the largest single tax increase in American history. And I ask them, how is this tax increase going to impact your family budget?

So I hear from people like the Peterson family in Van, Texas: "If you divide the amount by 12 months of the year, this tax increase comes out to \$229.58 per month. I am a widow, full-time college student, and single mother of a growing preteen boy. This amount would be impossible to squeeze out of my already overextended monthly income . . . This monthly amount is more than half of my monthly vehicle installment . . . A tax increase of that magnitude would mean that something would have to be given up in my household."

That is the budget that is being cut here, Mr. Chairman. The Peterson family in Van, Texas, they are having their budget cut. They are having their transportation budget cut. They can't afford their monthly car payments because of this bill, which, even though they deny it, is part of the single largest tax increase in American history.

Or from the Jordan family in Forney, Texas, in my district: "All of us have been affected by large increases in the price of gas for our cars, electricity rates, cost of water, and cost of food. My husband and I both drive older ve-

hicles and turn up our thermostat to uncomfortable levels . . . This tax increase reinforces the feeling that elected leaders could care less about the struggles of families trying to avoid going into ever-increasing debt."

Well, guess what? I agree, because once again we have a bill brought to the floor by the Democrat majority that is going to cut the family budget, that is going to cut the Jordan budget in Forney, Texas. And there are family budgets all across America that are going to be cut because this bill spends too much of the people's money. It takes away from their housing priorities, it takes away from their transportation priorities to fuel the government's, Washington's, view of their priority.

And that is why you are either part of the problem, or you are part of the solution. And the gentlewoman from Colorado's amendment is part of the solution, and we should adopt it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 3½ minutes to my friend from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I stand in full support of her amendment to cut one-half of 1 percent from a \$51 billion appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago when my colleague from Georgia had an amendment that wanted to cut 1 percent, 1 percent, 1 penny on the dollar, you ruled that the voice vote was enough, that the Democratic majority had rejected my colleague from Georgia's amendment to just cut 1 penny. And now my colleague from Colorado, you won't accept that. So we are asking you would you cut 50 cents, one-half of 1 percent?

When my colleague from Georgia was talking, the gentleman from Ohio called us this "fringe group" on that side of the aisle. This "fringe group." Well, Mr. Chairman, I am a proud member of that fringe group, as well as another 104 Members on this side of the aisle that are part of that fringe group, indeed, the majority of the minority. The gentleman from Ohio, who is part of that fringe group, the 30-Some-things, the next time I say that to him, I will say I am paying him a compliment. He is too young to remember the song from the musical "Oklahoma": "The Surrey With the Fringe on Top." But it is that fringe on top of the surrey that makes that carriage so beautiful that it is going to deliver some fiscal responsibility to the great people of this country.

And how many times, Mr. Chairman, have you seen a spot on television or

the radio where they tug at your heartstrings by asking, won't you just give 1 penny to the children, or won't you just give 1 penny to the starving people in Bangladesh, or won't you just give 1 penny to the veterans, or won't you give 1 penny to this group or that group? And what we are saying on this side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, is won't you just return 50 cents to the hardworking taxpayers of this country who are sweating, slaving, and working every day trying to make ends meet?

And as the gentlewoman from Colorado pointed out, this is not a cut. This is just reducing the increase from 6.7 percent of what we spent in fiscal year 2007 to 6.2 percent. And say to my friends, the Democratic majority, who want to increase spending \$81 billion in this fiscal year, when they are complaining about an \$8.9 trillion debt, how does that make sense, if you are concerned about the debt, and you have got these signs all over the Capitol, and you want to increase spending \$81 billion?

Let's get real. Let's get real. We asked you to cut 3 percent; you won't do that. We asked you to cut 1 percent; you won't do that. You won't even give a penny back. And we ask you to give half of a penny now in the gentlewoman's amendment from Colorado. It is the compassionate thing to do.

Vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. It is an amendment that I hope all our colleagues understand. It would reduce the increase in spending not by 3 percent, not by 1 percent, but by one-half of 1 percent. Now, it is not a cut.

The word "cut" gets misused on this floor, and we have heard it misused and misused and misused and misused here tonight. No one is proposing a cut.

We just heard a long discussion about how the last amendment was going to cut spending for airport security. It was going to cut spending for housing for the elderly. It was going to cut spending for this program and that program and the other program.

Let's assume every single one of those programs is a very worthy program. There is no doubt that they are. They are indeed very worthy programs. But not a single amendment has been proposed tonight, not one amendment, not one amendment proposed by my colleagues, would cut spending. Every single amendment proposed by this side, every single amendment proposed by my colleagues over here who have said we want to change the bill a tiny amount, would increase spending, but we would reduce the increase by a tiny amount.

□ 2015

Only in Washington can a reduction in an increase be called a cut with a straight face.

This bill grows spending by 6.7 percent. Almost no American is going to get an increase in their income this year, in their salary this year of 6.7 percent. So we said wait, wait, let's reduce the increase. We're going to have an increase; every amendment is going to have an increase. Let's just reduce that increase by a tiny amount, by a 3 percent reduction in the increase, or a 1 percent reduction in the increase, or on this one, one half of one penny on the dollar. And that's too radical. And that's called a cut.

Well, let's be honest; it's not a cut. None of these are a cut. But it is time to slow the pace of growth of government spending. It is time to slow the pace of that growth because it imposes a burden on every single American. And we are simply standing here, and I'm proud to stand here, and if somebody wants to call it a "fringe group," that's their choice. But I'm proud to stand here in defense of the American taxpayer and not to slash and burn and cut. There is no cut.

What we're saying is this side has proposed spending at an increase of 6.7 percent, almost three times the increase in inflation. We're simply saying how about take off one half of one penny.

I think the lady's amendment is right, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 1 minute; the gentleman from California has 17½ minutes.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, as I listen to this discussion tonight, I think about how varied the Members of Congress are. There are Members, I dare say, in this Congress that have never had a job, particularly a job that is menial labor.

I grew up in a home where we were poor, and at the time that was very difficult; but I look back on that and I'm happy that I learned to work. I'm happy, as a parent, that one of the values that we taught our children was to work and to work hard.

It was interesting to watch the experience of my teenagers when they had their first job outside the home. They worked really hard. And some of them had a pay schedule where they got paid after 2 weeks of work. And to see how they responded when they got their first paycheck, because they were startled about how much was taken out of their paycheck because they were anticipating a certain amount of earnings, and they didn't get all that money because they had to pay quite a bit in taxes. And I just am asking for a modest restraint here, one half of 1 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEINER). The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. Again, I thank the gentlewoman for offering the amendment to this bill, as she did to one of the prior bills, because it really does highlight the philosophical difference between the bipartisan majority of the House and the self-described "fringe" represented by the views we've heard tonight.

What is that philosophical division between the bipartisan majority and the Members that we have heard from this evening? Well, the bipartisan majority of this House believes that if we're going to ensure a stronger America, then we have to make an investment in that America. But we have to make the same kind of investment that our parents made and their parents so that we can enjoy the prosperity that we enjoy now; that we can't simply say, well, we're going to let our children and our grandchildren fend for themselves.

The bipartisan majority believes that that requires a responsible investment in our roads and our highways; a responsible investment in our aviation system; a responsible investment in our aviation security; a responsible investment in housing for the elderly, for the disabled, for those who are in need. That is a priority of the bipartisan majority. This is our philosophy.

Now, my friends expressing the minority view say, well, let's look at what the American family would do when the American family is facing budgetary pressures. So let's look at what the American family would do. My friends expressing the minority opinion tonight say they would set their priorities. Well, that's absolutely right, they would set their priorities, which means they wouldn't cut everything identically in their lives, which is just what the gentlewoman's amendment would do. It would cut everything across the board.

The American family, when they're facing a fiscal constraint, doesn't say, we're going to cut our medicine equally, we're going to cut our food equally, we're going to cut our essentials equally with how we cut cable TV, was one illustration given by my friends in the minority. No. They don't say we're going to cut the necessities the same amount we're going to cut the luxuries. They prioritize.

But my friends in the minority, with their across-the-board cuts, don't prioritize. And so they do make cuts, real cuts, not like my friend from Arizona claimed, which is, unfortunately, not correct. My friend from Arizona just claimed that nothing is really cut in the across-the-board amendment. But the reality is there are a great many things that are cut, real cuts, that don't have an increase in the bill sufficient to offset what the gentlewoman's amendment would cut.

So what are some of the real cuts the gentlewoman is proposing tonight? She

is proposing real cuts to the number of critical safety staff in aviation, safety staff that deals with the Office of Flight Standard and Aircraft Certification. They would be real cuts. Not cuts in growth, but real cuts, fewer people doing the safety inspections for our aircraft. Is that what the American family would choose to do when they're faced with a fiscal constraint? Would they choose to cut things that have the effect of making their families less safe? I don't think that's where they would look for the cuts.

What other real cuts has the gentlewoman been advocating? She's advocating real cuts in emergency response training for hazardous material transportation. That's a real cut the gentlewoman is advocating.

She is also advocating cuts in Native American housing grants. Is the gentlewoman prepared to tell the Native Americans back in her State that she favors real cuts to their housing assistance? I will be willing to yield on that question if the gentlewoman is ready to say, not hide behind an across-the-board amendment, but is ready to say to the Native Americans in her State, I support real cuts to your housing.

I will yield if the gentlewoman would like to respond to that question. Is the gentlewoman prepared to say, yes, I'm advocating tonight real cuts to the American housing in my State?

I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. What I would like to say to the citizens in the Fourth District in Colorado is that I'm very willing to take the increase from a 6.7 to a 6.2 percent increase.

Mr. SCHIFF. Well, I yielded the time to the gentlewoman, but she did not answer the question. Evidently she wasn't willing to tell the Native American population in her home State she is proposing an amendment to cut their housing tonight. She is willing to hide behind an across-the-board amendment, but is not willing to tell them directly what the effect of that amendment is.

The gentlelady's amendment would also cut, in very real terms, homeless assistance grants.

Now, let's get back to that philosophical difference between the bipartisan majority and the minority here tonight. One of my colleagues, my colleague from New Jersey, said, well, the American family has to make tough choices. And maybe they need to make the choice that not all of their kids can go to college. Well, that's the philosophical view of the minority opinion we hear tonight. Maybe the American family needs to make the choice that not all of their kids can go to college.

Well, the philosophical view of the bipartisan majority is that every child in America that wants to go to college should have the ability to go to college, notwithstanding whether they are rich or poor. That's our philosophy. And that's why we increased support in the Labor-HHS bill which, again, the

gentlewoman wanted to cut, to help more kids go to college. That's our philosophy, that if we're going to look after the future of this country, we're going to have to invest in the future. That means investing in our kids. And that means not putting American parents in a position where they have to say this child goes to college, this child does not. That is not our philosophy. It may be the philosophy of the gentleman from New Jersey; it may be the philosophy of the minority on the floor here tonight. It is not the philosophy of the bipartisan majority of this House, nor the American people.

Now, some of my friends in the minority here tonight say, okay, 6 years of GOP rule; we ran the country into the ground financially, we admit it. But we weren't responsible, we few here on the floor tonight, because we were standing up at the time. Well, I have to say that when we could have used your voices, we didn't hear them. When we could have used your voices, for example, earlier this year to try to achieve savings in the expenditures on oil and gas, when people go to the pump and they're paying record amounts, when we wanted to try to take that and invest it in the country's future instead of investing it in oil company profits, the friends in the minority here tonight had nothing to say. None of them were on their feet saying, yes, this is the time where we must cut corporate welfare because we can't afford it. Let's cut it 1 percent across the board.

When our seniors are trying to buy medicine and can't afford it and we take action here to bring down the cost of that medicine and save the government money because we're living in a finite world, did our friends stand up and say, yes, we have to be fiscally responsible? We have to try to help those families who are working, both heads of household, and can't afford medicine, or those seniors who can't afford medicine, so we're going to stand up for them; we're going to cut those corporate subsidies and corporate welfare? No. They were silent. It's only when it comes to cutting homeless assistance, cutting assistance for the elderly, and even cutting support for additional safety inspections for aircraft that our friends in the minority here tonight are willing to stand up.

So, yes, there is great philosophical difference here tonight between the bipartisan majority that believes we have to invest in the future of this country, between the bipartisan majority that doesn't think a parent should have to decide which child can go to college and which child can't, not based on the merit of that child, not based on the academic ability of that child or the gifts of those children, but because they can't afford to send both children to college.

There is a philosophical difference between the bipartisan majority that says that is unacceptable in America, that is not the America we want to see

in our future, and the philosophical views of the minority here tonight that say that's fine with us. We won't look elsewhere. We are willing to balance the budget on the backs of our kids and their kids, the homeless, the elderly and the others. Just stay away from corporate welfare because that is untouchable.

That is not the philosophy of the majority of this House. It will not carry the day when this amendment comes to a vote.

I urge my colleagues to join with the bipartisan majority and defeat these cuts to these vital services, and also to step up to the plate when we have the opportunities to reduce corporate welfare so that we can finance these essential services to let their voices be heard.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act for the mortgage insurance programs under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) may be used for any housing trust fund established under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would urge my colleagues to take a clear look at this commonsense amendment.

This is an amendment that addresses an area of the bill. The underlying bill itself, this appropriations bill, allows for money to be placed in a slush fund that would be used essentially for political purposes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this commonsense amendment that would prohibit the FHA from diverting money to help fund a "housing trust fund." This name for this is actually

part of the Orwellian democracy that I've talked about extensively with this new majority.

□ 2030

Because it really isn't a housing trust fund. It is a fund that is wholly unnecessary and wholly political.

This amendment would shield middle-class homeowners from the new majority's desire to fund a new expansion of government-built housing; again, with completely political paybacks. HUD already has a number of programs, a number of programs, Market-to-Market, the American Dream Downpayment Initiative, which are aimed at preserving existing affordable housing and expanding affordable homeownership.

The HOME Investment Partnerships Program, also administered by Housing and Urban Development, is the largest Federal block grant to State and local governments. It is dedicated exclusively to creating new affordable housing to low-income households.

The new Affordable Housing Trust Fund that is pending funding in this bill derives part of its funding from skimming money, and a lot of it, from FHA mortgage premiums and creates another mechanism which forces the Federal Government into the homebuilding business and with political nuances to it all.

As Assistant Secretary for Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner of the United States, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Brian Montgomery, pointed out at a recent hearing before the House Committee on Financial Services, FHA receipts are already credited toward HUD appropriations. As a result, any new program, any new program, like this one, takes that revenue at the expense of the previous HUD programs that I mentioned earlier. As Mr. Montgomery testified, we will be "robbing Peter to pay Paul." Now, why would we do this? Well, we would do it, I guess, because the majority party desires to have political direction over that money.

Mr. Chairman, is there any doubt that the provisions of the FHA modernization bill will create an incentive for FHA to charge higher premiums than is safe or prudent given that incentive? Pressure to hit certain revenue targets will cause a dramatic departure from today's environment where the FHA is able to work to ensure that low-income and first-time homebuyers are being charged the lowest possible premium. It will be those borrowers who pay the cost of this new housing trust fund, those least able to afford it, and likely those least able to desire any activity that smacks of the political cronyism that this slush fund would bring about.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to take a serious and prudent look at this commonsense amendment. I believe it is something that the entire House should be able to embrace. I hope they will support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The gentleman from Georgia is attempting to renew an authorizing fight, which is only a matter of days old, on the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill, and that is not the appropriate way to handle the question of the affordable housing trust.

Our capable authorizers, the chairman of the Financial Services Committee Mr. FRANK, and the Chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of that committee Ms. WATERS, have included an Affordable Housing Trust Fund in their FHA reform bill. That bill was passed by the House last week or 2 weeks ago. I forget which week it was.

Clearly there is a need for more affordable housing in this country. The Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University has documented that from 1993 to the year 2003 alone, we have lost 1.2 million affordable units. It is also documented that we have some 8 million households in this country who have incomes below 30 percent of the adjusted median income in their area. Those households all fall within the lowest, most vulnerable category of people who are eligible for assistance under the Housing and Urban Development Department. We are only providing somewhere in the total of 2.5- to 3 million units for all of that 8 million people and households who are falling within that very low-income category. However, we don't intend to step on the turf of our authorizing committee by renewing the fight about that bill, which passed, as I said, just a few days ago, on this bill tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those comments. I understand the lack of desire on the part of the appropriators to get into the business of the authorizers, but that is the way the system works here. One committee will authorize, and then the Appropriations Committee comes along and determines whether or not there ought to be money.

What this amendment says is that this House ought to say no, we ought not put money into a slush fund, into a housing slush fund that actually takes money away from programs that are demonstrated to have had excellent results, Market-to-Market, the American Dream Downpayment Initiative, the HOME Investment Partnerships Program.

This slush fund will take money away from those programs that have been very, very helpful to individuals across this Nation, low-income individ-

uals across this Nation, who are trying to get into a home. What it will do is substitute it with a slush fund that will be used for political purposes. There is no doubt about it. So it doesn't surprise me, I guess, that the majority party would oppose this amendment.

But I would ask my colleagues on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, to clearly look at this amendment and appreciate that none of us, none of us, ought be using this kind of money, the kind of money that allows low-income Americans to get into their home and have the American dream, realize the American dream, but to do so with political slush fund money. It just isn't appropriate. It is just not right.

So I urge my colleagues to take a serious look at this amendment and support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALBERG:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to promulgate regulations based on race, ethnicity, or sex.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to pose an important question to this House, and that question is this: Do we really need race, ethnic or gender-based preferences for roads?

Today I am offering an amendment to the transportation bill we are currently debating that would stipulate no funding in this bill may be used by the Department of Transportation to discriminate based on race, ethnicity or sex.

Though this policy may be motivated by good intention, I agree with Justice Clarence Thomas about the DOT's affirmative action programs where he states, "The paternalism that appears to lie at the heart of this program is at

war with the principle of inherent equality that underlies and infuses our Constitution."

Last fall in my home State, Michiganders voted overwhelmingly, 58 percent to 42 percent, in favor of amending our State constitution to outlaw racial preferences in public education, employment and contracting. Like my constituents in south-central Michigan, I oppose any and all forms of discrimination. But I also support nondiscrimination, the practice or policy of refraining from discrimination.

My support of nondiscrimination compels me to state on this floor that every American deserves equal treatment when competing for business contracts, and our Federal Government should treat all applicants for such contracts on an equal basis. The Federal Government should never view any American as part of a group, but rather look at them as an individual. By granting the Department of Transportation the ability to discriminate based on race or sex, this House would essentially create affirmative action preferences for our Nation's highways.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and ensure that all American businesses competing for public works projects are given a fair, non-discriminatory opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to go further on it. I think it is rather self-explanatory that we are talking here of just assuring the practice that we don't commit discrimination in the process of our hiring and contracting practices.

We in the State of Michigan labored long and hard during the last election cycle, from both sides, to indicate what value there was in making sure that under the context of our Constitution and the laws that have been put in place to enforce that Constitution, that we are each given rights to benefit from those unalienable rights, namely the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness or property. If we were to bridge that with any discriminatory practice, we take that away from one, and we can take it away from all.

For that purpose, this amendment is offered. I would appreciate the support of my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am almost speechless with the fact that this very simple amendment has not been challenged aggressively yet. It is a straightforward amendment. As I said very clearly and sincerely, not only am I opposed to discrimination, I am also strongly supportive of nondiscrimination. For that reason and

that reason alone, I ask that this amendment be adopted by my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my esteemed colleague if he has any speakers prepared to draw attention to this amendment? Otherwise, I think that we ought to close with acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle come together in unity on this and accept this proposal that seeks to provide that we don't have discriminatory practices that go on within our Department of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Either this is not a serious amendment or it is an exceedingly serious amendment. This amendment is either totally unnecessary or it has a really nefarious purpose. We do have rules and regulations, I think, that might come under the material of the legislation that support and require certain set-asides for minority or women-owned businesses in providing among all of our contracting in transportation departments, in some of those departments, and under certain circumstances. I think those are entirely appropriate.

I don't know whether this is the sort of thing that the gentleman was trying to get at, but I think that this has some entirely unknown effects. Perhaps I should have asked the gentleman whether he had particular things in mind that he knew about because I couldn't at first think of any.

Mr. Chairman, my chairman says I should accept the amendment, and I am going to accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for a colloquy.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee. The chairman has been a long-time advocate in improving safety standards in our Nation's transpor-

tation system. I appreciate his willingness to include report language regarding occupant ejection and motor coach and school bus standards in this legislation.

In March, a horrific accident occurred in my district when a bus carrying the Bluffton University men's baseball team crashed on Interstate 75 in Atlanta, Georgia, en route to a tournament in Florida. Six people were killed and 29 others were injured.

That week, Dr. Jeffrey Solomone from Grady Hospital's trauma center, where most of the victims were treated in Atlanta, called my office outraged. He knew that their deaths could have been prevented if they were simply wearing seat belts. Imagine working to save young lives when you knew their injuries were caused not from impact but from being thrown from the vehicle.

Last year, two teenage girls were killed in a similar accident in Beaumont, Texas. Advocates and family members accurately highlighted that the National Transportation Safety Board recommended that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration develop a safety standard in 1999.

In 2005, the SAFETEA-LU legislation reiterated this request and called for a national standard to be developed no later than October 1, 2009. I applaud the committee for demanding a status report on these standards. Simply said, it should not take 10 years to figure out a way to save lives. How much longer must we wait until a simple regulation is developed?

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Georgia that this and other important safety standards are the utmost priority of the committee, as they have been all of the years I have served on, earlier, the Transportation Subcommittee and now the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee.

Occupant ejection prevention is critical to saving lives. Motor coach and school bus accidents are not necessarily commonplace, but when these tragedies occur, they shake the Nation to its core. The committee highlighted that motor vehicle crashes are a leading cause of death for young Americans, and strong safety standards are the cornerstone to protecting American lives.

I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this issue, and I remain committed, as will the committee, to ensuring that NHTSA meets this and subsequent deadlines to develop national standards that save lives in an expeditious manner.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman to make sure that we do not have to wait until the last possible moment in 2009 for changes to be made.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and his staff for working so hard on this legislation and making a commitment to safety and security on America's roads.

Mr. OLVER. I would just comment it should be possible to get out this kind of regulation earlier than October 1, 2009. We will see what we can do about that.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue the colloquy with the gentleman from Georgia on an additional subject, and I continue to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor to compliment the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. OLVER, on preparing an excellent and well-balanced appropriation bill.

The large number of important priorities included in this bill create difficult choices, and the chairman has done an excellent job balancing the competing interests and preparing a good bill for consideration in the full House.

As the co-Chair of the House COPD Caucus, I want to speak about one item that falls under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, and that is the implementation of the 1986 Air Carrier Access Act. This act was intended to protect individuals with disabilities who fly on commercial air carriers from discriminating practices. The legislation has done a reasonably good job of protecting most passengers.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

While the legislation has done a reasonably good job of protecting most passengers with disabilities, it has had limited success in influencing air carriers to accommodate the needs of disabled individuals who require supplemental oxygen.

Currently, as an example, air carriers have the authority to allow or disallow the use of portable oxygen systems aboard their planes even when the Department of Transportation and the FAA find that the systems are safe. This leaves the use of oxygen systems supplied by the carrier. Potential layovers and delays between flights are an additional health risk and barrier to access to air flight.

In September 2005, the Department of Transportation recognized this problem and issued a notice of proposed rulemaking to clarify this situation to assist the flying public who are in need of assisted breathing devices.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor to commend the Department of Transportation for recognizing the problem and for issuing this proposed rule. The final rule will provide uniform standards that will allow passengers to carry



their FAA-approved devices onboard. I ask the chairman to work with me to encourage the FAA to issue a rule expeditiously.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. In answer, I thank the Congressman from Georgia for bringing this issue to my attention, to our attention. I am sure that the Department will consider all valid points of view in this process, and I stand committed to making certain that the Department issues its final rule as you've suggested in an expeditious manner in the very near term.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide homeownership assistance for applicants described in 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) to know if he would not speak on the matter, I am quite willing to accept the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the offer of the chairman. I wonder if he might concede to a 15-second blurb here in order to get a couple of words into the RECORD. I appreciate the incentive and the concession.

This amendment simply says none of the funds shall be used to hire people who are not legal and eligible to work within the United States. That's it. I think we have a consensus on this.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. This amendment is merely a restatement of current law which already prohibits the employment of unauthorized aliens. I do not read it as imposing any new burden on those who use funds appropriated under this act. Rather, it is fully consistent with the current legal obligations imposed on all homeownership assistance applicants regardless of whether or not they use such funds.

I accept the amendment and yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment follows through on the theme of the previous amendment, only it addresses that no homeownership assistance will be applicable to those who aren't legal to work or lawfully present in the United States. Again, it is a simple concept. It supports current law.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am happy to yield.

Mr. OLVER. As far as I can see, the amendment is essentially the same. It is based on exactly the same citation in the U.S. Code but has a different target. But again, the amendment is merely a restatement of current law which already prohibits the employment of unauthorized aliens. So again, the rest of my previous statement applies, and I am willing to accept the amendment if the ranking member is also willing to do so.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman for his comments. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I accept the amendment as well.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2100

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to implement the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (relating to wage rate requirements; commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that strikes the requirements for the Davis-Bacon Act within the appropriations of this bill, and the Davis-Bacon issue is something that I have lived with for at least my 28 years in the construction business as an owner and operator, and we'd add about four or five more years as an employee.

I have received Davis-Bacon wage scales. I've paid Davis-Bacon wage scales. I've managed my way through the combination of paperwork and requirements that are part of this. I'm maybe the only one in Congress who has real hands-on experience for years of dealing with the additional costs that are involved with the Federal wage scale that's Davis-Bacon.

And my numbers throughout my history of working with these projects vary from anywhere from 8 percent increase in the cost of the projects up to 35 percent increase in the cost of the projects. I round that down to a round number of 20 percent additional costs.

We're in a situation where we're arguing that we need to bring in more labor from foreign countries to do this work, and yet we're setting a Federal wage scale for this work, and we know that labor is developed by supply and demand. I am a supporter of labor being able to collectively negotiate the value of their work, but I'm not a supporter of the Federal Government telling the workers and the employers what they need to pay their employees.

I believe that if two adult individuals want to enter into a contractual agreement, they should be able to do so without interference of the Federal Government. This is not a prevailing wage in practice. It's only a prevailing wage by statute. Actually, it is union scale imposed upon wherever the money is spent.

Any construction project with \$2,000 or more in it takes the inflationary cost of a Davis-Bacon wage scale. Some places, it's actually below the prevailing wage. Other places, it distorts that prevailing wage dramatically. In almost all cases, it costs a lot of money, and for example, if it's a 20 percent increase, then if you can build five projects or 5 miles of road, this will let you build six. Why would we limit the resource and the infrastructure that we are building with this project by imposing such a draconian, top-down,

Federal management tool that not only costs a lot more money, but it makes it a lot, lot harder to manage your projects?

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The amendment would eliminate the requirement that the funding provided in this bill comply with the prevailing wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Let me remind my colleagues that the Davis-Bacon law was enacted about 75 years ago by a Republican Congress and a Republican administration.

The law sets minimum labor standards for workers employed in Federal contract construction and ensures that workers are paid at least the locally prevailing wage. There's no good reason for denying prevailing wage protection to workers involved in transportation. This is an issue of fairness for working men and women.

Without Davis-Bacon, the transportation construction industry, which is responsible for building our highways and transit systems, might suffer from low-bid firms that aim to undercut local wages and perform construction on the cheap.

Davis-Bacon encourages a higher quality of workmanship, and we should not do away with the law for transportation construction where we need the highest quality and the longest lasting workmanship.

I urge a rejection of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise as one, again, who has worked on union shop and merit shop jobs, both as an employer and as an employee. As an employer, having been a union shop, I have paid union scale and also, of course, prevailing wage, Davis-Bacon wage scale. I've worked under a union shop, and I've worked on a merit based, and to look at the difference in the workmanship, I don't think we can apply high quality strictly to union. In fact, merit shop employees do a fantastic job with the work that they're doing, and they take pride in it, and they have to compete in the competition of the project.

My son's now in the construction business, the second generation King Construction. I know the decisions he has to make, and sometimes he will pick up a set of plans and take a look at that and figure on bidding that project and find out that it's a Davis-Bacon wage scale. He understands that

that messes up his flow of his employees, and it limits his ability to manage those employees on the job.

For example, if you're paying an excavator operator \$24 an hour and you're paying your laborer on the ground with a shovel or a grease gun let's say \$10, that man is not going to get off of that excavator and pick up that grease gun or pick up that shovel, even if it's for a half hour or an hour if he knows he's going to be paid union scale for that when he could be paid the \$24 an hour to sit on the machine. Those things work against our efficiency.

My greatest frustration with Davis-Bacon wage scale is not the wage itself. It's that it takes away my ability to manage a project and my ability to provide incentives for employees to make decisions themselves on the ground.

I have to manage them more when they're under a Davis-Bacon wage scale. I have to tell them what to do. I know people that are owners and operators of their company who get up in the morning and go out to the job at five o'clock to grease and service their machines because they can't afford to pay their operator to get out the grease gun and do it, and they'll be there at night, too, working 16 hours a day while that employee is at 8 hours a day on a Davis-Bacon wage scale.

It distorts the work we do. It distorts the skills and the complement of the skills, and it raises the cost of everything that we do in the construction business. It injects the Federal Government in the way between that relationship between an employer and employee.

Additionally, my employees have received 12 months of work, not seasonal work, health insurance benefits and vacation pay, all of that flowing because we can pay them what they're worth for a week's work as opposed to an inflated value of what they're worth for an hour's work. They make out better, we make out better, and we've got more consistent employees. That goes across this country almost universally.

So I would urge adoption of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONAWAY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. It is the sense of the House of Representatives that any reduction in the amount appropriated by this Act achieved as a result of amendments adopted by the House should be dedicated to deficit reduction.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity tonight to point out one more time one of the quirks of the rules that we operate under.

We have heard over the last 2 days many of my colleagues come to these microphones and propose reductions in spending in this particular area of the Federal budget, very eloquent, very passionate, to try to reduce this spending.

But the harsh reality is, should any of those amendments have passed or should any of the ones that we're about to vote on pass, the reality is that that spending does not, in fact, get cut out of this budget. This spending would simply be spent in conference and would not reduce the deficit or, should we ever get to that point, increase the surplus.

So my amendment would simply state the sense that instead of continuing the practice, the age-old practice of spending whatever is in 302(b) allocation, whether it's warranted or not, we would actually take an opportunity to reduce spending which I think folks on both sides of the aisle, many people on both sides of the aisle would say is arguably one of the things that we ought to be doing and studying.

This is not a revolutionary position to take, but it's one in which I think it makes sense. Most folks in Texas in District 11 would clearly understand the intent of what I'm trying to do. In fact, it would come as a shock to them to know that if we found 218 votes to adopt the 1 percent cut or the half a percent cut or the 25-basis point cut, that all of that hard work would be for naught and that that money would still get spent.

So I understand there's a point of order that lies against this. I will not push for a ruling from the Chair. I just wanted to simply take the opportunity tonight to point out to my colleagues that we need to change the rules. We need to change the way we operate in this House, and this would be one of those that we ought to seriously consider doing so that the will of the House could operate to actually change spending if that were, in fact, the case.

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to say this tonight, and I will not push the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amount otherwise provided in this Act for "Grants-in-Aid for Airports" administered by the Federal Aviation Administration of the Department of Transportation is hereby decreased by \$10,000,000 and increased by \$10,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman and I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee. Let me thank both of the individuals, the chairperson, Mr. OLIVER, and the ranking member, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for their leadership. I thank you so very much.

We've worked on this issue in the past, and I think many of us are aware of the surrounding neighborhoods around large airports, and I know that as Members of Congress we have been challenged by that because we recognize that the vitality of airports certainly support the economy of our cities.

I happen to represent a very large airport in Houston, Texas, and I also represent the neighborhoods that surround it. At this time, of course, we are working on a number of noise studies in our area, and it is a continuing journey as our airport continues to expand. Sometimes it takes money but sometimes it takes policy.

We recognize that one of the advantages of modern life is the convenience of air travel. America's air transportation system is the best and safest in the world, but airports are not quiet. If you ask any resident that lives near a busy airport, you will hear many grievances about the noise level.

Although there is no way to make airports soundproof, it is possible to reduce airport noise so it is less disruptive to the lives of the families that live near some of the Nation's busiest airports who work and pay their taxes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to encourage the Federal Aviation Administration to be more

proactive in helping communities reduce, eliminate or cope with the ever increasing levels of airport noise.

Specifically, I call upon the FAA to undertake a nationwide study of airport mitigation problems and best practices at the 10 busiest airports in America and report its findings, along with recommendations to address major problems found to be existing, to the Congress within 180 days.

□ 2115

Under the airport improvement program administered by the FAA, grants are available to airports and local governments to fund noise reduction projects located in areas significantly affected by airport noise above 65 decibels over a 24-hour average, as indicated by the notation 65 dB(A) DNL. Noise mitigation grants are generally not available for areas in which the noise level may be substantial, but does not exceed 65.

Please, all of you, join me in those surrounding neighborhoods, and try to be able to resolve or to be able to accept the noise at that level. Therefore, money does not solve the problem; policy does. So we would like to ensure that we have the real information opportunity to determine the impact, substantial impacts that occurred to millions of people well below the 65 decibel level.

Information generates policy. This value is inadequate for several reasons. We find from the scientific perspective, it is not supported by research. The 65 decibel level is derived from the Schultz curve, which correlated people reporting being highly annoyed by noise with noise levels. Substantial impact occurs well before people become highly annoyed. In addition, the data used in the Schultz curve for airports show that highly annoyed occurs around 57 decibels, not 65. That comes from the Journal of Acoustical Society of America.

The EPA has identified 55 dB(A) DNL as a more appropriate noise level. The day-night average sound level is the level of noise expressed in decibels as a 24-hour average, and averages do not adequately account for the impact of aircraft noise on individuals.

Research has shown that the noise disruption as low as 55 decibels can negatively affect communities near airports. Our airports are trying. In my own district, we have had several meetings. I know that this issue is a concern, because we have addressed this question in airports and cities around the Nation, including the State of Minnesota.

It is important to stress that this amendment does not entitle any airport, local government or other eligible entity, to receive a noise mitigation grant, nor does it have any financial impact that reduces funding in noise mitigation. This amendment provides for an opportunity for focusing on the issue of noise mitigation and the difficulty of using a singular num-

ber, 65, while communities around the Nation suffer.

We are going to continue to pursue this. We have done this every year to bring attention to this problem of noise mitigation and the fact that no person who lives in and around an airport acknowledges the fact that the airport is not important, but what we are trying to emphasize is that we must provide solace for those who live surrounding airports.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes it takes money, but sometimes it takes policy. We recognize that one of the advantages of modern life is the convenience of air travel. America's air transportation system is the best and safest in the world, but airports are not quiet. If you ask any resident that lives near a busy airport, you will hear many grievances about the noise level.

Although there is no way to make airports soundproof, it is possible to reduce airport noise so it is less disruptive to the lives of the families that live near some of the Nation's busiest airports, work and pay their taxes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to encourage the Federal Aviation Administration to be more proactive in helping communities reduce, eliminate, or cope with ever-increasing levels of airport noise. Specifically, I call upon the FAA to undertake a nationwide study of airport noise mitigation problems and best practices at the 10 busiest airports in America and report its findings, along with recommendations to address major problems found, to the Congress within 180 days.

Mr. Chairman, under the Airport Improvement Program administered by the FAA, grants are available to airports and local governments to fund noise reduction projects located in areas significantly affected by airport noise above 65 decibels over a 24-hour average, as indicated by the notation 65 dB(A) DNL. Noise mitigation grants are generally not available for areas in which the noise level may be substantial but does not exceed the 65 dB(A) DNL. Therefore money does not solve the problem; policy does.

However, substantial impacts occur to millions of people well below the 65 decibel level. This value is inadequate for several reasons:

From a scientific perspective, it is not supported by research. The 65 decibel level is derived from the Schultz Curve which correlated people reporting being highly annoyed by noise with noise levels.

Substantial impact occurs well before people become highly annoyed. In addition, the data used in the Schultz Curve for airports shows that "highly annoyed" occurs around 57 decibels, not 65, and that comes from a Journal of the Acoustical Society of America.

The EPA has identified 55 dB(A) DNL as a more appropriate noise level. The day/night average sound level is the level of noise expressed in decibels as a 24-hour average, and averages do not adequately account for the impacts of aircraft noise on individuals.

Research has shown that noise disruption as low as 55 decibels can negatively affect communities near airports. Unfortunately, communities that have a dB(A) less than 65 are precluded from applying for an Airport Improvement Program grant to reduce airport noise. We need to help them. I have even

heard from cities in Minnesota. It is all over the country.

It is important to stress that this amendment does not entitle any airport, local government or other eligible entity to receive a noise mitigation grant. Nor does it have any financial impact. This amendment does not even affect an applicant's eligibility to be considered for an airport noise reduction grant. Each applicant must demonstrate that its proposed project deserves to be funded, but no applicant can be disqualified from consideration merely because the area covered by the grant request does not have a dB(A) DNL greater than 65.

Mr. Chairman, communities coexisting with major airports is one of the great challenges of modern life. My amendment is intended to help us rise to that challenge.

I urge all members to support my amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I too am concerned about the environmental impact of aviation. Noise is a very serious issue and impossible to solve to the satisfaction of all. Although new technologies and planes and air space redesign will assist in the noise problem with the number of passengers projected in the near future, noise will continue to be a problem.

I commend the gentlewoman for bringing this issue to our attention, as she has time after time. As I say, it will continue to be a problem. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment as well.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in violation of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, with respect to workers on federally-funded transportation projects.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the two subcommittee Chairs. Might I

just for a moment thank them for a bill that is enormously challenging, transportation and housing.

I want to thank the staff for their very hard work and the commitment that this particular bill has in place as it relates to the Treasury and other agencies. Let me acknowledge the importance of hard work as well.

Mr. Chairman, we can't do without the workers that provide the engine of our economy. If we are to appreciate workers, I think it is extremely important that we do not have outside forces that would, in fact, take away from the dignity and the responsibility to the American worker; and that's what my amendment is about.

It is a very simple amendment. It is sometimes fashionable to speak ill about working Americans who are in unions. This amendment simply provides support for union workers on federally funded projects, simple without any additions to it. It is to reinforce the importance of that work and to reinforce the importance of those workers.

I believe that the engine of America is fused by American workers, and many of them are both union and non-union workers. I stand today to affirm all workers. My amendment simply asks that those Federal funds that are utilized, nothing is done in the federally funded project to undermine America's workers.

I believe that we have had a long history of the American labor movement. It was started by a group of dreamers who simply believed that we should have the best working atmosphere for America's workers. Employees represented by free and democratic unions of their own choosing participate actively in determining their wages, hours and working conditions.

Their living standards are the highest in the world. Their job rights are protected by collective bargaining. They have fringe benefits that were unheard of less than a generation ago.

I know that the support of these workers is bipartisan. I ask my colleagues to join me in a very simple amendment that ensures that these projects that are federally funded comply with the law, simply comply with the law, and do not undermine the working people of America.

I ask my colleagues to support working people, working people of America, as we issue Federal funds so that they can be protected.

My amendment is simple but makes an important contribution to the legislation. My amendment simply provides that none of the funds made available in this appropriations bill shall be used in a manner inconsistent with the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is fashionable today to disparage, downplay, or minimize the importance of organized labor to our country. That is easy to do but it would be wrong. In the post 9-11 age, where our transportation systems and infrastructure have been demonstrated to be targets of those who would do us harm, it is more important than ever that

those who work in the transportation sectors are the best, most able, most professional, most experienced, and committed workers this nation has to offer. To do otherwise would put the security of our nation at risk.

Mr. Chairman, those who would destroy or further limit the rights of organized labor—those who would cripple collective bargaining or prevent organization of the unorganized—do a disservice to the cause of democracy.

Fifty years or so ago the American Labor Movement was little more than a group of dreamers, and look at it now. From coast to coast, in factories, stores, warehouse and business establishments of all kinds, industrial democracy is at work.

Employees, represented by free and democratic trade unions of their own choosing, participate actively in determining their wages, hours and working conditions. Their living standards are the highest in the world. Their job rights are protected by collective bargaining agreements. They have fringe benefits that were unheard of less than a generation ago.

Our labor unions are not narrow, self-seeking groups. They have raised wages, shortened hours and provided supplemental benefits. Through collective bargaining and grievance procedures, they have brought justice and democracy to the shop floor. But their work goes beyond their own jobs, and even beyond our borders.

Our unions have fought for aid to education, for better housing, for development of our national resources, and for saving the family-sized farms. They have spoken, not for narrow self-interest, but for the public interest and for the people.

Mr. Chairman, unions are as important as they ever were—because corporations are just as dedicated to their bottom line, regardless of the consequences for workers. The nature of work in America is changing. Employers are trying to shed responsibilities—for providing health insurance, good pension coverage, reasonable work hours and job safety protections, for example—while making workers' jobs and incomes less secure through downsizing, part-timing and contracting out. Working people need a voice at work to keep employers from making our jobs look like they did 100 years ago, with sweatshop conditions, unlivable wages and 70-hour workweeks.

In my hometown of Houston, I know firsthand the commitment, dedication, and professionalism of organized transit workers employed by the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County (METRO). These workers are making the transportation system of Houston one of the best in the nation. Accordingly, I want to take this opportunity to extol their accomplishments and to express my commitment to the protection of their hard won right to engage in and enjoy the benefits of collective bargaining. I think most of my colleagues can agree that these hard won rights should not be taken away or undermined, and my amendment reaffirms this proposition.

And lest we forget, Mr. Chairman, it was the men and women of organized labor who rushed into the burning World Trade Center Towers when others were rushing out. The men and women of organized labor put their lives on the line for their fellow Americans every day. They do not ask for much. All they ask is to be treated with respect and dignity. They want what we all want: to do their jobs and to make a better life for their families.

The least we in the Congress can do, Mr. Chairman, is to go on record in support of our working men and women in the vitally important transportation industries of our country. We can and should affirm that none of the funds made available in this appropriations bill shall be used in a manner that undercuts the hard won rights of American workers that are reflected in the National Labor Relations Act and other important federal labor laws.

I urge all members to support my amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as I reflect on what the Labor Relations Act of 1935 means, it says specifically in the act that there will be no discrimination with regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment by membership in any labor organization, et cetera, and essentially says, by my recollection, that no one shall be coerced into joining a union, nor shall they be discouraged from joining a union.

It's a balanced labor relations act that's there, but the statement that was made by the gentlelady from Texas said it provides for a report for projects on federally funded projects. I don't know where that might exist in the statute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from Texas for a question. I noticed in your remarks your amendment provides for a report for union workers on federally funded projects. I don't recognize where that might be in the 1935 act, and I am wondering, since I don't see it in your amendment, what the basis of that might be.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I think you might have misheard me. I think I indicated that in the past amendment I asked for a report from the FAA.

My concern here is simply a statement of affirmation that federally funded projects protect the workers that are on those projects and protect those who may be associated with the union. I don't believe that we asked for a study.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlelady from Texas. I did happen to write that quote down verbatim, I am confident.

We have a lot of debate here on the floor. Some of us offered more than one amendment. I would simply thank the gentlelady for that statement.

I, for myself, we have the law on the books, and this law is a neutral law. It's not one that promotes union labor, and it's not one that promotes non-union labor. It's one that promotes the freedom and the discretion of the employee to make that decision.

It does allow for union members to approach workers on the job. That's a protection that's in there, but it also allows the freedom for those workers to make the decision as to whether they would want to collectively bargain or not based upon a vote within that workforce.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I yield such time as is needed by the gentlewoman to finish the explanation of her amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am grateful that the gentleman from Iowa raised the question, if you would, because I do want to reinforce what the amendment says.

The amendment specifically says, with respect to workers on federally funded transportation projects. So your sensitivity is clarified by the amendment.

As I indicated in my remarks, I am affirming all workers, labor and union and nonunion. It is a generic term. I want to make sure that we treat workers on federally funded projects fairly and balanced, and that they are not diminished if they are on federally funded projects. We have many individuals who work after the project is finished, and I want to make sure that they are protected as well, union and nonunion.

The amendment is simply a straightforward affirmation of the protection of workers on federally funded transportation projects.

With that in mind, I would ask my colleagues to affirm the importance of protecting workers on federally funded transportation projects, under section A of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935.

With that, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I would hope that my colleagues would see this as an affirming amendment of all American workers.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady from Texas for that clarification. I listened carefully to the presentation, and the clarification comes now that it is union and nonunion workers protected equally alike, on balance, between union and merit shop employees.

The advocacy here is for current law. Now, as we have made this clarification into this record, I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my opposition to the amendment and congratulate the gentlelady from Texas. I appreciate her patience.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2130

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments

that I would like to subsequently withdraw. I would like them taken en bloc.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of the bill before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to prohibit transportation workers from having walkie talkies, two-way radios, or any other handheld communication device.

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to limit the use of any available technology in the development of modular or manufactured temporary disaster housing.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the en bloc amendments.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. It is my intent to withdraw both of these amendments, and I will just briefly describe my intent to continue to work with authorizers on these two very vital points.

We have firsthand experience with the tragedy of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and many of the constituents in my congressional district are alumni of trailers, the same trailers that have proved to be dangerous and unhelpful and useless. I hope that we will continue to work with the relevant agencies to look at alternative technology for housing so that in our future disasters, we can be able to work effectively. There has been effective legislation moving on this issue, and I know that the many constituents that are impacted by poor housing will welcome this Congress continuing to work on that particular issue.

I move quickly to the question of security and safety on the question of transportation workers who drive a number of transportation vehicles throughout America. In many instances, in my own hometown of Houston, these very transportation workers, particularly bus drivers, do not have the necessary safety equipment such as walkie-talkies, such as two-way radios, such as other handheld communication devices. I will look forward to working with the appropriate committees to address the question of these particular workers who are begging for relief. A recent tragedy in Houston with an assault on a bus driver brought this particular issue to a head. We look forward to working with the various committee Chairs on trying to bring some

response to those transportation workers across America driving transportation vehicles.

I ask for unanimous consent to withdraw the two amendments that have been placed pending on the record, to withdraw both amendments.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the en bloc amendments are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, earlier today during the consideration of H.R. 3074, this body considered an amendment from Mr. FRANK and Mr. RANGEL, providing that no funds in this act may be used to implement the community service requirement of public housing residents. At that time I accepted the amendment, as did the ranking member Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and the amendment was adopted by a voice vote. At the behest of the Republican leadership, I intend to ask unanimous consent to vacate that vote and have a recorded vote.

At this point I yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) to explain what this amendment did, since at that earlier time I had wheedled him out of his time by accepting the amendment in the first place, and he needs to explain the amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will not object to the unanimous consent request. It will forestall a 15-minute vote and make it a 2-minute vote. And I appreciate the cooperative spirit from the gentleman of Michigan on this as throughout he has been cooperative. I understand other decisions get made, but I did just ask the indulgence of the House because people shouldn't be voting on something with no explanation.

There was implemented in 1998 in legislation, and I think it was part of an appropriations bill then, a requirement that everybody who lives in public housing who is not otherwise fully employed work 8 hours a month in community service. It is not highly regarded by the people who run public housing. It costs money to do this. Understand, when a similar amendment was proposed for the section 8 vouchers, it was defeated, it authorized the Housing Authority to hire someone to administer it. This is not work that is terribly useful.

The way the amendment is written, if you were working, and you are fired or your job ends because of trade or other problems as some people in public housing and you are unemployed, you then have to do 8 hours a month of make-work. So it is a make-work requirement does nobody any good, it is based on the assumption that you can't trust those lazy people in public housing across the board, and it costs

money to administer. So that is why the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who has long been a proponent of it, and myself have offered this amendment.

I thank the gentleman for a chance to explain it.

Mr. OLVER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the adoption by voice vote of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) be vacated, to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 22 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. HUNTER of California.

An amendment by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

An amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

An amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 327, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 705]

#### AYES—97

Akin	Gingrey	Nunes
Bachmann	Gohmert	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Gordon	Pence
Barrow	Graves	Petri
Bartlett (MD)	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Hastert	Platts
Billray	Heller	Poe
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Herger	Putnam
Boehner	Hunter	Ramstad
Burgess	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Jindal	Roskam
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Keller	Sali
Cantor	King (IA)	Schmidt
Carter	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Coble	Lamborn	Shadegg
Conaway	Linder	Shimkus
Cooper	Lungren, Daniel E.	Smith (NE)
Davis, David	Mack	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Sullivan
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Tancredo
Feeney	McCaul (TX)	Terry
Flake	McHenry	Thornberry
Fortenberry	Mica	Walberg
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Fox	Musgrave	Weldon (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Myrick	Westmoreland
Gallegly	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)		

#### NOES—327

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hall (NY)
Ackerman	Crenshaw	Hare
Aderholt	Crowley	Harman
Alexander	Cuellar	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Altmire	Cummings	Hayes
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Herseth Sandlin
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hill
Baird	Davis (KY)	Hinchee
Baker	Davis, Lincoln	Hinojosa
Baldwin	Davis, Tom	Hirono
Bean	DeFazio	Hobson
Becerra	DeGette	Hodes
Berkley	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Berman	DeLauro	Holden
Berry	Dent	Holt
Biggart	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hooley
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Hulshof
Blumenauer	Dingell	Inslee
Blunt	Doggett	Israel
Bonner	Donnelly	Jackson (IL)
Bono	Doolittle	Jackson-Lee
Boozman	Doyle	(TX)
Bordallo	Drake	Jefferson
Boren	Dreier	Johnson (GA)
Boswell	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Boucher	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Boustany	Ellison	Jones (NC)
Boyd (FL)	Ellsworth	Jones (OH)
Boyd (KS)	Emanuel	Kagen
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Kanjorski
Brady (TX)	Engel	Kaptur
Braley (IA)	English (PA)	Kennedy
Brown (SC)	Eshoo	Killdee
Brown, Corrine	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Brown-Waite,	Everett	Kind
Ginny	Faleomavaega	King (NY)
Buchanan	Fallin	Kirk
Butterfield	Farr	Klein (FL)
Calvert	Fattah	Knollenberg
Capito	Ferguson	Kucinich
Capps	Filner	Kuhl (NY)
Capuano	Forbes	Lampson
Cardoza	Fortuno	Langevin
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Carson	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Castle	Giffords	Latham
Castor	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Chandler	Gillibrand	Lee
Christensen	Gillmor	Levin
Clay	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)
Cleaver	Goode	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)
Cohen	Granger	Lipinski
Cole (OK)	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Costa	Green, Gene	Loebsock
Costello	Grijalva	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Gutierrez	Lowey



Lucas  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul

Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Pickering  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—12

Bachus  
Bishop (UT)  
Clarke  
Conyers

Cubin  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Honda  
LaHood

Marshall  
Moran (VA)  
Radanovich  
Young (AK)

## □ 2205

Messrs. HINCHEY, PASCRELL and TANNER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY  
MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 86, noes 338, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 706]  
AYES—86

Akin  
Bachmann  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bilbray  
Blackburn  
Boehner  
Boozman  
Buchanan  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Davis, David  
Deal (GA)  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Flake  
Fossella

Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gingrey  
Goode  
Graves  
Hall (TX)  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Issa  
Jindal  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
Kingston  
Kline (MN)  
Lamborn  
Linder  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McHenry  
Miller (FL)  
Moran (KS)

## NOES—338

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Bono  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley

Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLaHunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Drake  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Faleomavaega  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fortuño  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes

McCaull (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickering  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)

Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Price (GA)  
Radanovich  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Smith (TX)  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Thornberry  
Walberg  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (SC)  
Wu

Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)

Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder

## NOT VOTING—12

Bachus  
Bishop (UT)  
Blunt  
Clarke

Conyers  
Cubin  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Honda

LaHood  
Marshall  
Peterson (PA)  
Young (AK)

## □ 2210

Mrs. SCHMIDT changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are urged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 362, noes 63, not voting 11, as follows:

## [Roll No. 707]

## AYES—362

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen

Altmire	Everett	Marchant	Sestak	Sutton	Waters	[Roll No. 708]	
Andrews	Faleomavaega	Matheson	Shadegg	Tancredo	Watson	AYES—133	
Arcuri	Fallin	Matsui	Shea-Porter	Tanner	Watt		
Baca	Fattah	McCarthy (CA)	Sherman	Taylor	Waxman	Akin	Gallegly
Bachmann	Feeney	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus	Terry	Weiner	Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)
Baird	Ferguson	McCaul (TX)	Shuler	Thompson (CA)	Welch (VT)	Barrett (SC)	Gingrey
Baker	Forbes	McCollum (MN)	Shuster	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (FL)	Bartlett (MD)	Goode
Baldwin	Fortenberry	McCotter	Simpson	Thornberry	Westmoreland	Barton (TX)	Goodlatte
Barrett (SC)	Fox	McGovern	Sires	Tiahrt	Wexler	Biggart	Granger
Barrow	Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Skelton	Tiberi	Whitfield	Bilirakis	Graves
Bartlett (MD)	Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Slaughter	Tierney	Wicker	Blackburn	Hall (TX)
Barton (TX)	Gallegly	McIntyre	Smith (NE)	Turner	Wilson (NM)	Blunt	Hastert
Becerra	Garrett (NJ)	McKeon	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)	Wilson (OH)	Boehner	Hastings (WA)
Berkley	Gerlach	McMorris	Smith (TX)	Upton	Wilson (SC)	Bonner	Hayes
Berry	Giffords	Rodgers	Solis	Velázquez	Wolf	Bono	Heller
Biggart	Gilchrest	McNerney	Souder	Visclosky	Woolsey	Boozman	Hensarling
Bilbray	Gillibrand	McNulty	Space	Walberg	Wu	Brady (TX)	Herger
Bilirakis	Gillmor	Meek (FL)	Spratt	Walden (OR)	Wynn	Brown (SC)	Hoekstra
Bishop (GA)	Gingrey	Melancon	Stearns	Walsh (NY)	Yarmuth	Brown-Waite,	Hulshof
Bishop (NY)	Gohmert	Mica	Stupak	Walz (MN)	Young (FL)	Hunter	Hunter
Blackburn	Goode	Michaud	Sullivan	Wamp		Ginny	Inglis (SC)
Boehner	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)				Burgess	Issa
Bonner	Gordon	Miller (MI)				Burton (IN)	Jindal
Bono	Granger	Miller (NC)	Bean	Fortuño	Meeks (NY)	Buyer	Johnson, Sam
Boozman	Graves	Miller, Gary	Berman	Fossella	Neal (MA)	Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam
Bordallo	Green, Al	Miller, George	Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Oliver	Campbell (CA)	Jones (NC)
Boren	Green, Gene	Mitchell	Blunt	Gonzalez	Price (NC)	Cannon	Jordan
Boswell	Grijalva	Mollohan	Cannon	Harman	Rangel	Cantor	Keller
Boucher	Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)	Capps	Herger	Reichert	Carter	Kingston
Boustany	Hall (TX)	Moore (WI)	Conyers	Hoyer	Reynolds	Chabot	Kline (MN)
Boyd (FL)	Hare	Moran (KS)	Cooper	Inslee	Ros-Lehtinen	Coble	Lamborn
Boyda (KS)	Hastert	Moran (VA)	Crowley	Israel	Ruppersberger	Cole (OK)	Lewis (KY)
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Rush	Conaway	Linder
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Murphy, Patrick	Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda	Culberson	Lucas
Braley (IA)	Hayes	Murphy, Tim	Delahunt	Kind	T.	Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel
Brown (SC)	Heller	Murtha	Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Shays	Davis, David	E.
Brown, Corrine	Hensarling	Musgrave	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline (MN)	Smith (WA)	Deal (GA)	Mack
Brown-Waite,	Herseeth Sandlin	Dicks	Dicks	Knollenberg	Snyder	Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo
Ginny	Higgins	Dreier	Dreier	Larsen (WA)	Tauscher	Drake	Marchant
Buchanan	Hill	Ehlers	Ehlers	Lofgren, Zoe	Towns	Dreier	McCarthy (CA)
Burgess	Hinche	Emanuel	Emanuel	Lungren, Daniel	Udall (NM)	Duncan	McCaul (TX)
Burton (IN)	Hinojosa	Engel	Engel	E.	Van Hollen	Everett	McCotter
Butterfield	Hirono	Farr	Farr	Markey	Wasserman	Fallin	McCrery
Buyer	Hobson	Filner	Filner	McCrery	Schultz	Feeney	McHenry
Calvert	Hodes	Obey	Flake	McDermott	Weller	Flake	McKeon
Camp (MI)	Hoekstra	Ortiz				Forbes	McMorris
Campbell (CA)	Holden	Pallone				Fortuño	Rodgers
Cantor	Holt	Pascarell				Fossella	Miller (FL)
Capito	Hooley	Pastor	Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall	Fox	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Hulshof	Paul	Bishop (UT)	Gutierrez	Stark	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Cardoza	Hunter	Payne	Clarke	Honda	Young (AK)		
Carnahan	Inglis (SC)	Pearce	Cubin	LaHood			
Carney	Issa	Pence					
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Perlmutter					
Carter	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)					
Castle	(TX)	Peterson (PA)					
Castor	Jefferson	Petri					
Chabot	Jindal	Pickering					
Chandler	Johnson (GA)	Pitts					
Christensen	Johnson (IL)	Platts					
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Poe					
Cleaver	Jones (NC)	Pomeroy					
Clyburn	Jones (OH)	Porter					
Coble	Jordan	Price (GA)					
Cohen	Kagen	Pryce (OH)					
Cole (OK)	Kanjorski	Putnam					
Conaway	Kaptur	Radanovich					
Costa	Keller	Rahall					
Costello	Kildee	Ramstad					
Courtney	Kilpatrick	Regula					
Cramer	King (IA)	Rehberg					
Crenshaw	Kingston	Renzi					
Culberson	Kirk	Reyes					
Cummings	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez					
Davis (AL)	Kucinich	Rogers (AL)					
Davis (IL)	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (KY)					
Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)					
Davis, David	Lampson	Rohrabacher					
Davis, Lincoln	Langevin	Roskam					
Davis, Tom	Lantos	Ross					
Deal (GA)	Larson (CT)	Rothman					
DeFazio	Latham	Roybal-Allard					
DeGette	LaTourette	Royce					
DeLauro	Lee	Ryan (OH)					
Dent	Levin	Ryan (WI)					
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	Salazar					
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sali					
Donnelly	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez, Loretta					
Doolittle	Linder	Sarbanes					
Doyle	Lipinski	Saxton					
Drake	LoBiondo	Schakowsky					
Duncan	Loeback	Schiff					
Edwards	Lowey	Schmidt					
Ellison	Lucas	Schwartz					
Ellsworth	Lynch	Scott (GA)					
Emerson	Mack	Scott (VA)					
English (PA)	Mahoney (FL)	Sensenbrenner					
Eshoo	Maloney (NY)	Serrano					
Etheridge	Manzullo	Sessions					

## NOES—63

## NOT VOTING—11

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members have 1 minute remaining to cast their vote.

□ 2215

Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. WATSON, Ms. DEGETTE, and Messrs. WEINER, HINOJOSA, and LANTOS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are urged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 292, not voting 11, as follows:

## NOES—292

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Giffords
Ackerman	Cohen	Gilchrest
Aderholt	Conyers	Gillibrand
Alexander	Cooper	Gillmor
Allen	Costa	Gohmert
Altmire	Costello	Gonzalez
Andrews	Courtney	Gordon
Arcuri	Cramer	Green, Al
Baca	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Baird	Crowley	Grijalva
Baker	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Cummings	Hall (NY)
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Hare
Bean	Davis (CA)	Harman
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Davis, Lincoln	Herseeth Sandlin
Berman	Davis, Tom	Higgins
Berry	DeFazio	Hill
Bilbray	DeGette	Hinche
Bishop (GA)	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Hirono
Blumenauer	Dent	Hobson
Bordallo	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hodes
Boren	Dicks	Holden
Boswell	Dingell	Holt
Boucher	Doggett	Hooley
Boustany	Donnelly	Hoyer
Boyd (FL)	Doolittle	Inslee
Boyd (KS)	Doyle	Israel
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Braley (IA)	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Brown, Corrine	Ellison	(TX)
Buchanan	Ellsworth	Jefferson
Butterfield	Emanuel	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Capito	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	English (PA)	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Eshoo	Kagen
Cardoza	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Faleomavaega	Kaptur
Carney	Farr	Kennedy
Carson	Fattah	Kildee
Castle	Ferguson	Kilpatrick
Castor	Filner	Kind
Chandler	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Christensen	Frank (MA)	Kirk
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Klein (FL)
Cleaver	Gerlach	Knollenberg

Kucinich	Neal (MA)	Sires	Blunt	Gingrey	Paul	Kucinich	Napolitano	Shea-Porter
Kuhl (NY)	Norton	Skelton	Boehner	Gohmert	Pearce	Kuhl (NY)	Neal (MA)	Sherman
Lampson	Oberstar	Slaughter	Bonner	Goode	Pence	Langevin	Norton	Sires
Langevin	Obey	Smith (NJ)	Bono	Goodlatte	Petri	Lantos	Oberstar	Skelton
Lantos	Oliver	Smith (WA)	Boozman	Granger	Pitts	Larsen (WA)	Obey	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Ortiz	Snyder	Brady (TX)	Graves	Platts	Larson (CT)	Oliver	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Solis	Brown (SC)	Hall (TX)	Poe	Latham	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
Latham	Pascrell	Souder	Brown-Waite,	Hastert	Price (GA)	Lee	Pallone	Snyder
LaTourette	Pastor	Space	Ginny	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)	Levin	Pascrell	Solis
Lee	Payne	Spratt	Buchanan	Hayes	Putnam	Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Space
Levin	Perlmutter	Stark	Burgess	Heller	Radanovich	Lewis (GA)	Payne	Spratt
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Stupak	Burton (IN)	Hensarling	Ramstad	Lipinski	Perlmutter	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (PA)	Sutton	Buyer	Herger	Regula	LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Lipinski	Petri	Tanner	Calvert	Hoekstra	Rehberg	Loeb sack	Peterson (PA)	Sutton
LoBiondo	Platts	Tauscher	Camp (MI)	Hulshof	Reynolds	Lofgren, Zoe	Pickering	Tauscher
Loeb sack	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)	Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)	Lowey	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe	Porter	Thompson (MS)	Cannon	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)	Lynch	Porter	Thompson (MS)
Lowey	Pryce (OH)	Tierney	Cantor	Issa	Rogers (MI)	Mahoney (FL)	Price (NC)	Tierney
Lynch	Rahall	Towns	Capito	Jindal	Rohrabacher	Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Towns
Mahoney (FL)	Ramstad	Turner	Carter	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Markey	Rangel	Turner
Maloney (NY)	Rangel	Udall (CO)	Castle	Jones (NC)	Roskam	Matsui	Reichert	Udall (CO)
Markey	Regula	Udall (NM)	Chabot	Jordan	Royce	McCarthy (NY)	Renzi	Udall (NM)
Matheson	Reichert	Upton	Coble	Keller	Ryan (WI)	McCollum (MN)	Reyes	Van Hollen
Matsui	Renzi	Van Hollen	Cole (OK)	King (IA)	Sali	McDermott	Rodriguez	Velázquez
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Velázquez	Conaway	Kingston	Schmidt	McGovern	Ross	Visclosky
McCollum (MN)	Rodriguez	Visclosky	Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner	McHugh	Rothman	Walsh (NY)
McDermott	Rogers (AL)	Walden (OR)	Lamborn	Lampson	Sessions	McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
McGovern	Ross	Walsh (NY)	Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Shadegg	McNerney	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
McHugh	Rothman	Wasserman	Davis, David	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus	McNulty	Rush	Schultz
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Dent	Davis, Tom	Linder	Shuler	Meek (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Waters
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Diaz-Balart, L.	Deal (GA)	Lucas	Shuster	Meeks (NY)	Salazar	Watson
McNulty	Rush	Diaz-Balart, M.	Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson	Melancon	Sánchez, Linda	Watt
Meek (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Donnelly	Draze	E.	Smith (NE)	Michaud	T.	Watt
Meeks (NY)	Salazar	Watt	Dreier	Mack	Smith (TX)	Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Melancon	Sánchez, Linda	Waxman	Duncan	Manzullo	Souder	Miller, George	Sarbanes	Weiner
Mica	T.	Weiner	Ellsworth	Marchant	Stearns	Mollohan	Saxton	Welch (VT)
Michaud	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch (VT)	English (PA)	Matheson	Sullivan	Moore (KS)	Schakowsky	Wexler
Miller (MI)	Sarbanes	Weller	Everett	Tanner	Tancredo	Moore (WI)	Schiff	Wilson (OH)
Miller (NC)	Saxton	Whitfield	Fallin	McCaul (TX)	Taylor	Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)	Wolf
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wicker	Feeney	McCotter	Terry	Murphy (CT)	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Mitchell	Schiff	Wilson (NM)	Flake	McCrery	Thornberry	Murphy, Patrick	Serrano	Wu
Mollohan	Schwartz	Wilson (OH)	Forbes	McHenry	Tiahrt	Murphy, Tim	Sestak	Wynn
Moore (KS)	Scott (GA)	Wolf	Fortenberry	McKeon	Tiberi	Nadler	Shays	Yarmuth
Moore (WI)	Scott (VA)	Woolsey	Fortuño	McMorris	Upton	Napolitano		
Moran (VA)	Serrano	Wu	Fossella	Rodgers	Walberg			
Murphy (CT)	Sestak	Young (FL)	Galgely	Mica	Walden (OR)			
Murphy, Patrick	Shays		Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Wamp			
Murphy, Tim	Shays		Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)			
Murtha	Sherman		Giffords	Miller, Gary	Weller			
Nadler	Sherman		Gillmor	Mitchell	Westmoreland			
Napolitano	Simpson			Moran (KS)	Whitfield			
				Musgrave	Wicker			
				Myrick	Wilson (NM)			
				Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)			
				Nunes	Young (FL)			

## NOT VOTING—11

Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Bishop (UT)	Honda	Price (NC)
Clarke	King (IA)	Young (AK)
Cubin	LaHood	

## □ 2219

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 250, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 709]

## AYES—177

Akin	Barrett (SC)	Biggert
Altmire	Bartlett (MD)	Bilbray
Bachmann	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Baker	Bean	Blackburn

## NOES—250

Abercrombie	Cohen	Green, Al
Ackerman	Conyers	Green, Gene
Aderholt	Cooper	Grijalva
Alexander	Costa	Gutierrez
Allen	Costello	Hall (NY)
Andrews	Courtney	Hare
Arcuri	Cramer	Harman
Baca	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Baird	Cuellar	Herseth Sandlin
Baldwin	Cummings	Higgins
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Hill
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hinchey
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Berman	Davis, Lincoln	Hirono
Berry	DeFazio	Hobson
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hodes
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Holden
Blumenauer	Dicks	Holt
Bordallo	Dingell	Hooley
Boren	Doggett	Hoyer
Boswell	Doolittle	Inslaw
Boucher	Doyle	Israel
Boustany	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Boyd (FL)	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Boyd (KS)	Ellison	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Emanuel	Jefferson
Braley (IA)	Emerson	Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Engel	Johnson (IL)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Etheridge	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Faleomavaega	Kagen
Cardoza	Farr	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Fattah	Kaptur
Carney	Ferguson	Kennedy
Carson	Filner	Kildee
Castor	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Chandler	Gilchrest	Kind
Christensen	Gillibrand	King (NY)
Clay	Gonzalez	Kirk
Cleaver	Gordon	Klein (FL)
Clyburn		Knollenberg

## NOT VOTING—9

Bachus	Cubin	LaHood
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Clarke	Honda	Young (AK)

## □ 2224

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 229, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 710]

## AYES—198

Aderholt	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Akin	Blunt	Buyer
Alexander	Boehner	Calvert
Altmire	Bonner	Camp (MI)
Bachmann	Bono	Campbell (CA)
Baker	Boozman	Cannon
Barrett (SC)	Boustany	Cantor
Bartlett (MD)	Brady (TX)	Capito
Barton (TX)	Brown (SC)	Carter
Bean	Brown-Waite,	Castle
Biggert	Ginny	Chabot
Bilbray	Buchanan	Coble
Bilirakis	Burgess	Cole (OK)

Conaway	Inglis (SC)	Platts	Matsui	Pomeroy	Solis	Hastert	McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooper	Issa	Poe	McCarthy (NY)	Porter	Space	Hastings (WA)	McHenry	Roskam
Crenshaw	Jindal	Price (GA)	McCollum (MN)	Price (NC)	Spratt	Hayes	McKeon	Royce
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)	McDermott	Rahall	Stark	Hensarling	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	Jones (NC)	Putnam	McGovern	Rangel	Stupak	Herger	Rodgers	Sali
Davis, David	Jordan	Radanovich	McHugh	Regula	Sutton	Hoekstra	Mica	Schmidt
Davis, Tom	Keller	Ramstad	McIntyre	Reichert	Tauscher	Hulshof	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Deal (GA)	King (IA)	Rehberg	McNulty	Renzi	Thompson (CA)	Inglis (SC)	Moran (KS)	Sessions
Dent	King (NY)	Reynolds	Meek (FL)	Reyes	Thompson (MS)	Issa	Musgrave	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Rogers (AL)	Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Tierney	Jordan	Myrick	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Rogers (KY)	Michaud	Ross	Towns	Keller	Neugebauer	Shuster
Donnelly	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)	Miller (NC)	Rothman	Turner	King (IA)	Paul	Smith (NE)
Drake	Lamborn	Rohrabacher	Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)	Kingston	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Dreier	Lampson	Ros-Lehtinen	Mollohan	Ruppersberger	Udall (NM)	Kline (MN)	Pence	Stearns
Duncan	LaTourette	Roskam	Moore (KS)	Rush	Van Hollen	Knollenberg	Petri	Sullivan
Ellsworth	Lewis (CA)	Royce	Moore (WI)	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez	Kuhl (NY)	Pickering	Tancred
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)	Moran (VA)	Salazar	Visclosky	Lamborn	Pitts	Thornberry
English (PA)	Linder	Sali	Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Walsh (NY)	Lewis (CA)	Poe	Tiahrt
Everett	LoBiondo	Saxton	Murphy, Patrick	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Walz (MN)	Lewis (KY)	Price (GA)	Tiberi
Fallin	Lucas	Schmidt	Murphy, Tim	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Linder	Putnam	Tiberti
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner	Murtha	Schakowsky	Schultz	Lucas	Radanovich	Walberg
Flake	E.	Sessions	Nadler	Schiff	Waters	Lungren, Daniel	Regula	Wamp
Forbes	Mack	Shadegg	Napolitano	Schwartz	Watson	E.	Rehberg	Weldon (FL)
Fortenberry	Mahoney (FL)	Shays	Neal (MA)	Scott (GA)	Watt	Mack	Reichert	Westmoreland
Fortuño	Manzullo	Shimkus	Norton	Scott (VA)	Waxman	Manzullo	Reynolds	Wicker
Fossella	Marchant	Shuler	Oberstar	Serrano	Weiner	Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Matheson	Shuster	Obey	Sestak	Welch (VT)	McCaul (TX)	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson	Oliver	Shea-Porter	Wexler	McCotter	Rohrabacher	
Frelinghuysen	McCauley (TX)	Smith (NE)	Ortiz	Sherman	Wilson (OH)			
Gallegly	McCotter	Smith (NJ)	Pallone	Sires	Woolsey			
Garrett (NJ)	McCrery	Smith (TX)	Pascarell	Skelton	Wu			
Gerlach	McHenry	Souder	Pastor	Slaughter	Wynn			
Giffords	McKeon	Stearns	Payne	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth			
Gilchrest	McMorris	Sullivan	Perlmutter	Snyder				
Gillibrand	Rodgers	Tancred	Peterson (MN)					
Gillmor	McNerney	Tanner						
Gingrey	Melancon	Taylor						
Gohmert	Mica	Terry						
Goode	Miller (FL)	Thornberry						
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Tiahrt						
Granger	Miller, Gary	Tiberi						
Graves	Mitchell	Upton						
Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Walberg						
Hastert	Musgrave	Walden (OR)						
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Wamp						
Hayes	Neugebauer	Weldon (FL)						
Heller	Nunes	Weller						
Hensarling	Paul	Westmoreland						
Herger	Pearce	Whitfield						
Hill	Pence	Wicker						
Hobson	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (NM)						
Hoekstra	Petri	Wilson (SC)						
Hulshof	Pickering	Wolf						
Hunter	Pitts	Young (FL)						

## NOES—229

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Crowley	Hirono
Allen	Cuellar	Hodes
Andrews	Cummings	Holden
Arcuri	Davis (AL)	Holt
Baca	Davis (CA)	Hooley
Baird	Davis (IL)	Hoyer
Baldwin	Davis, Lincoln	Inslee
Barrow	DeFazio	Israel
Becerra	DeGette	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	Delahunt	Jackson-Lee
Berman	DeLauro	(TX)
Berry	Dicks	Jefferson
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Johnson (IL)
Blumenauer	Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.
Bordallo	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Boren	Edwards	Kagen
Boswell	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Boucher	Ellison	Kaptur
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Kennedy
Boyd (KS)	Engel	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Kilpatrick
Braley (IA)	Etheridge	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Faleomavaega	Klein (FL)
Butterfield	Farr	Knollenberg
Capps	Fattah	Kucinich
Capuano	Ferguson	Kuhl (NY)
Cardoza	Filner	Langevin
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Carney	Gonzalez	Larsen (WA)
Carson	Gordon	Larson (CT)
Castor	Green, Al	Latham
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lee
Christensen	Grijalva	Levin
Clay	Gutierrez	Lewis (GA)
Cleaver	Hall (NY)	Lipinski
Clyburn	Hare	Loeb sack
Cohen	Harman	Lofgren, Zoe
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Lowey
Costa	Herseth Sandlin	Lynch
Costello	Higgins	Maloney (NY)
Courtney	Hinchey	Markey

## NOT VOTING—9

Bachus  
Bishop (UT)  
Clarke

Cubin  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Honda

LaHood  
Marshall  
Young (AK)

□ 2228

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF  
GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 283, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 711]

## AYES—142

Aderholt	Burton (IN)	Ehlers
Akin	Buyer	Everett
Alexander	Camp (MI)	Fallin
Bachmann	Campbell (CA)	Feeney
Baker	Cannon	Flake
Barrett (SC)	Cantor	Forbes
Barton (TX)	Chabot	Fortenberry
Biggert	Coble	Fortuño
Bilbray	Cole (OK)	Fossella
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fox
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Blunt	Culberson	Gallegly
Boehner	Davis (KY)	Garrett (NJ)
Bonner	Davis, David	Gillmor
Bono	Deal (GA)	Gingrey
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Gohmert
Brown (SC)	Brown (SC)	Goode
Brown-Waite,	Doolittle	Goodlatte
Ginny	Drake	Granger
Buchanan	Dreier	Graves
Burgess	Duncan	Hall (TX)

Abercrombie	Doggett	Klein (FL)
Ackerman	Donnelly	Kucinich
Allen	Doyle	Lampson
Altmire	Edwards	Langevin
Andrews	Ellison	Lantos
Arcuri	Ellsworth	Larsen (WA)
Baca	Emanuel	Larson (CT)
Baird	Emerson	Latham
Baldwin	Engel	LaTourette
Barrow	English (PA)	Lee
Bartlett (MD)	Eshoo	Levin
Bean	Etheridge	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Faleomavaega	Lipinski
Berkley	Farr	LoBiondo
Berman	Fattah	Loeb sack
Berry	Ferguson	Lofgren, Zoe
Bishop (GA)	Filner	Lowey
Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	Mahoney (FL)
Bordallo	Gerlach	Maloney (NY)
Boren	Giffords	Markey
Boswell	Gilchrest	Matheson
Boucher	Gillibrand	Matsui
Boustany	Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)
Boyd (FL)	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Boyd (KS)	Green, Al	McCollum (MN)
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	McDermott
Brady (TX)	Grijalva	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	McHugh
Brown, Corrine	Hall (NY)	McIntyre
Butterfield	Hare	McNerney
Calvert	Harman	McNulty
Capito	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Capps	Heller	Meeks (NY)
Capuano	Herseth Sandlin	Melancon
Cardoza	Higgins	Michaud
Carnahan	Hill	Miller (MI)
Carney	Hinchey	Miller (NC)
Carson	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Carter	Hirono	Miller, George
Castle	Hobson	Mitchell
Castor	Hodes	Mollohan
Chandler	Holden	Moore (KS)
Christensen	Holt	Moore (WI)
Clay	Hooley	Moran (VA)
Cleaver	Hoyer	Murphy (CT)
Clyburn	Hunter	Murphy, Patrick
Cohen	Inslee	Murphy, Tim
Conyers	Israel	Murtha
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Nadler
Costa	Jackson-Lee	Napolitano
Costello	(TX)	Neal (MA)
Courtney	Jefferson	Norton
Cramer	Jindal	Nunes
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Oberstar
Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Obey
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Oliver
Davis (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ortiz
Davis (IL)	Jones (NC)	Pallone
Davis, Lincoln	Jones (OH)	Pascarell
Davis, Tom	Kagen	Pastor
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Payne
DeGette	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Delahunt	Kennedy	Peterson (MN)
DeLauro	Kildee	Peterson (PA)
Dent	Kilpatrick	Platts
Dicks	Kind	Pomeroy
Dingell	King (NY)	Porter
	Kirk	Price (NC)

## NOES—283

Pryce (OH) Shays  
 Rahall Shea-Porter  
 Ramstad Sherman  
 Rangel Shuler  
 Renzi Simpson  
 Reyes Sires  
 Rodriguez Skelton  
 Rogers (MI) Slaughter  
 Ross Smith (NJ)  
 Rothman Smith (WA)  
 Roybal-Allard Snyder  
 Ruppertsberger Solis  
 Rush Souder  
 Ryan (OH) Space  
 Salazar Spratt  
 Sanchez, Linda Stark  
 T. Stupak  
 Sanchez, Loretta Sutton  
 Sarbanes Tanner  
 Saxton Tauscher  
 Schakowsky Taylor  
 Schiff Terry  
 Schwartz Thompson (CA)  
 Scott (GA) Thompson (MS)  
 Scott (VA) Tierney  
 Serrano Towns  
 Sestak Turner

## NOT VOTING—11

Bachus Davis, Jo Ann Walsh (NY)  
 Bishop (UT) Honda Whitfield  
 Clarke LaHood Young (AK)  
 Cubin Marshall

## □ 2231

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 278, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 712]

## AYES—148

Aderholt Cole (OK) Goodlatte  
 Akin Conaway Granger  
 Bachmann Crenshaw Graves  
 Baker Culberson Hall (TX)  
 Barrett (SC) Davis (KY) Hastert  
 Bartlett (MD) Davis, David Hastings (WA)  
 Barton (TX) Davis, Tom Hayes  
 Bilbray Deal (GA) Heller  
 Bilirakis Dent Hensarling  
 Blackburn Doolittle Herger  
 Boehner Drake Hoekstra  
 Bonner Dreier Hulshof  
 Bono Duncan Hulshof  
 Boozman Ehlers Inglis (SC)  
 Boustany Everrett Issa  
 Brady (TX) Fallin Jindal  
 Brown (SC) Feeney Johnson, Sam  
 Buchanan Flake Jones (NC)  
 Burgess Forbes Jordan  
 Burton (IN) Fortenberry Keller  
 Buyer Fortuño King (IA)  
 Calvert Foxx Kingston  
 Camp (MI) Franks (AZ) Kline (MN)  
 Campbell (CA) Frelinghuysen Knollenberg  
 Cannon Gallegly Lamborn  
 Cantor Garrett (NJ) Latham  
 Carter Gingrey Lewis (CA)  
 Chabot Gohmert Lewis (KY)  
 Coble Goode Linder

Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (FL)

Abercrombie  
 Ackerman  
 Alexander  
 Allen  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Baca  
 Baird  
 Baldwin  
 Barrow  
 Bean  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Biggert  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt  
 Bordallo  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boyd (FL)  
 Boyda (KS)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Butterfield  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson  
 Castle  
 Castor  
 Chandler  
 Christensen  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Lincoln  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly  
 Doyle  
 Edwards  
 Elgison  
 Ellsworth  
 Emanuel

Lucas  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Mack  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul (TX)  
 McCrery  
 McHenry  
 McKeon  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Moran (KS)  
 Musgrave  
 Myrick  
 Neugebauer  
 Nunes

Emerson  
 Engel  
 English (PA)  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Faleomavaega  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Ferguson  
 Filner  
 Fossella  
 Frank (MA)  
 Gerlach  
 Giffords  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillibrand  
 Gillmor  
 Gonzalez  
 Gordon  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (NY)  
 Hare  
 Harman  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Herseth Sandlin  
 Higgins  
 Hill  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Hobson  
 Hodes  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kirk  
 Klein (FL)  
 Kucinich  
 Kuhl (NY)  
 Lampson  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 LaTourette  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loebbeck  
 Schakowsky  
 Lowey  
 Lynch

## NOES—278

Shadegg  
 Simpson  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Souder  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Tancredo  
 Terry  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Walberg  
 Wamp  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Young (FL)

Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McCotter  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHugh  
 McIntyre  
 McNeerney  
 McNulty  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Melancon  
 Michaud  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Murtha  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Norton  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Pallone  
 Pascarella  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (NC)  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rodriguez  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Berry  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bordallo  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Butterfield  
 Capps

Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shays  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Space

## NOT VOTING—10

Bachus  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Clarke  
 Cubin  
 Davis, Jo Ann  
 Honda  
 LaHood  
 Marshall  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Young (AK)

## □ 2235

Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, please note that I mistakenly voted “yes” on amendment 8, the King Amendment, regarding the funding provisions and the Davis-Bacon Act. I meant to vote “no” but voted “yes.” It was too late to change the vote. Given the opportunity I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 220, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 713]

## AYES—207

Abercrombie  
 Ackerman  
 Allen  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Baca  
 Baird  
 Baldwin  
 Bean  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bordallo  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carson  
 Castor  
 Chandler  
 Christensen  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Lincoln  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly  
 Doyle  
 Ellison  
 Ellsworth  
 Emanuel  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Faleomavaega  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Frank (MA)  
 Giffords  
 Gillibrand  
 Gonzalez  
 Green, Al  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (NY)

Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inlee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loebsock  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui

McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.

Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yarmuth

Nunes  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Saxton  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Souder  
Space  
Stearns

Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Wu  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—9

Bachus  
Bishop (UT)  
Clarke

Cubin  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Honda

LaHood  
Marshall  
Young (AK)

□ 2239

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008”.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3074, the FY08 Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill.

I want to thank Chairman OBEY, Chairman OLVER, Ranking Member KNOLLENBERG and the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this piece of legislation.

This bill contains vital funding for the Houston METRO's North and Southeast New Starts projects. The New Starts project will allow METRO to continue funding implementation of rail and bus rapid transit portions in the North Corridor Project and the Southeast Corridor Projects that are in or service our district.

METRO will use this funding for final design, land acquisition and construction for the North Corridor Project and the Southeast Corridor Projects.

Houston is the Nation's fourth largest city and the region is becoming increasingly congested. We have a critical need for a comprehensive rapid transit system.

The funds that have been allocated for the New Starts Program will improve mobility and transportation options for my constituents and benefit the greater Houston area.

This bill also contains funding for an Economic Development Initiative for the Harris County Community and Economic Department's Community Transit Study.

This funding will allow HUD to study two areas in our district, the Northshore area and city of Galena Park, for transit improvements such as sidewalks, street lights, and transit shelters.

Unfortunately, this bill does not provide funding for several projects that I strongly support.

These projects are: the Harrisburg Grade Crossing, Texas Department of Transportation's Design and Construction of Direct Connectors from Beltway 8 to U.S. 59 North, the city of Baytown's Texas Avenue

Streetscape Program, the Brays Bayou Bike/Pedestrian Bridge at Mason Park, the Houston Zoo's Enhanced Zoo Interpretives Project, and the Houston Port Region's Economic Recovery Task Force.

While it is impossible to fund all of the projects that we request, I believe that these programs need Federal funding.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with House earmark reforms, I would like to place into the RECORD a listing of Congressionally-directed projects in my home State of Idaho that are contained within the report to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee. I am grateful for their inclusion in this bill.

I'd like to take just a few minutes to describe why I supported these projects and why they are valuable to the Nation and its taxpayers.

The bill contains \$900,000 for the City of Rocks Back Country Byway in my Congressional District. This 16.7 mile long project is located on the popular City of Rocks Back Country Byway in Cassia County, Idaho, and provides the only direct access to the City of Rocks National Reserve. When fully completed, the project will pave a 1.0 mile gravel segment, reconstruct 15.7 miles of deficient roadway, correct deteriorated road and slope conditions, provide a wider road with shoulders and guardrail, and improve the road's alignment by reducing the number and severity of sharp curves and steep grades. These improvements will increase safety for the driving public and provide safer access for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. These improvements will also significantly reduce the amount of ongoing maintenance required to keep the route usable. This project has received Federal funding in previous years. This project was requested by the Idaho Transportation Department.

The report contains \$300,000 for the I-84, Curtis Road to Broadway IC Widening. This project would widen I-84 through east Boise, adding eastbound and westbound fourth lanes. This widening is needed to alleviate congestion and safety issues caused by the continued fast growth in the Treasure Valley. This project was requested by the Idaho Transportation Department.

The report contains \$500,000 for the Idaho Transit Coalition's program to improve bus and bus facilities all across the State of Idaho. The funding will assist Ada County Highway District's Commuteride, Boise State University, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, the City of Ketchum, the Ketchum/Sun Valley Transit Authority, KART, the City of Moscow, the City of Pocatello, the University of Idaho, and Valley Regional Transit. The majority of these projects are identified in the “Idaho Statewide Public Transportation Needs and Benefits Study” compiled by the Idaho Transportation Department in 1996 and subsequent local studies and plans. All projects are identified in the Transportation Improvement and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan. The current request represents only a small amount of what will be needed to maintain and expand Idaho's public transportation capital system to meet the demands of the State's rapidly growing population. This project has received federal funding in previous years. The funding was requested by the Idaho Transit Coalition.

## NOES—220

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Bachmann  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carney  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David

Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fortuño  
Fossella  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Gene  
Hall (TX)  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseht Sandlin  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hulshof

Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Jindal  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer



The report contains \$150,000 for the Historic Wilson Theater Restoration Project in Rupert, Idaho. The Wilson Theater was built in 1920 and is on the National Register of Historic Places. The Theater is also part of Rupert's Historic Business District. Rupert is a predominantly rural community that recently experienced the closure of its largest employer, Kraft Cheese. The restoration of this theater is one aspect of the community's effort to revitalize itself, attract new employers and generate interest in the community. The community thus far has raised over \$1 million in private donations to restore the building, and federal funds will be only a small part of overall expenses. This project was requested by the non-profit Renaissance Art Center, Inc. in Rupert, Idaho.

The report contains \$50,000 for the Custer County Economic Development Initiative in Custer County, Idaho. The vast size of Custer County presents enormous financial challenges for a county that is overwhelmingly owned by the federal government. Custer County has a very small tax base with very large costs for maintaining roads and service over a very large area. This funding will permit the county to purchase and renovate an old middle school in Challis that would become a government and business center housing the offices of the City, County, and Economic Development offices and making them ADA compliant. Additionally, funding would help to provide for improvements to a multi-government complex in the City of Stanley and the rodeo grounds in the City of Mackay. This project would relieve an enormous strain on the limited yearly budget of Custer County and allow it to more efficiently deliver services to residents and visitors alike. This project was requested by Custer County, Idaho.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally directed projects in my region and an explanation of my support for them: 1.) \$150,000 for Historic Wilson Theater Restoration Project; Rupert, Idaho; 2.) \$50,000 for Custer County Economic Development Initiative; Custer County, Idaho; 3.) \$900,000 for City of Rocks Back Country Byway, Idaho; 4.) \$500,000 for Idaho Transit Coalition buses and bus facilities; and 5.) \$300,000 for I-84, Curtis Road to Broadway IC Widening, Boise, Idaho.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the FY08 Labor/HHS & Education Appropriations bill. I want to commend the Chairman and the staff for an excellent bill which signals a new direction and reflects our priorities as a Nation.

The goal of this bill has always been to make a strong investment in our future—to take seriously our responsibility to the American public, on the issues that affect people every day from our health to our children's education to the scientific research that will find the cures of tomorrow, from protecting workers to providing the training they need to make it in today's economy. I must say that this time around, our bill does not disappoint.

To help States serve 6.8 million unemployed and 13 million jobseekers, the bill provides a \$227.4 million or 1.9 percent increase over fiscal year 2007 for employment, training, and worker protection programs. On worker protection, the bill provides a \$45.5 million increase to key programs to improving safety and health for 113 million workers.

On education, the bill provides historic increases in No Child Left Behind, 8.4 percent

above 2007, including \$1.9 billion more for Title I grants to schools. For students with disabilities, the President's budget proposed to cut IDEA Part B grants by \$291 million or 2.7 percent below the fiscal year 2007 level. In contrast, this bill provides a \$299 million or a 2.8 percent increase over last year. More importantly, this bill reverses a 2-year decline in the federal contribution toward the rising costs of special education for 6.9 million children with disabilities.

It also makes real progress toward college affordability with a significant increase in Pell Grants, allowing us to raise the maximum Pell Grant by \$390 to \$4,700 and benefiting over 5.5 million students without reducing or eliminating other student financial assistance programs.

In the area of medical research, the bill provides continued investment at the NIH and CDC for innovative programs that save lives. With a \$750 million increase over last year, NIH will be able to support another 545 new and competing research grants over last year's level and 1,262 over the President's request.

The bill also provides much-needed investments in programs that support low income people: An increase of \$500.8 million or 23.2 percent above last year for LIHEAP to secure energy assistance for approximately 1 million more low-income seniors and families than last year. \$660.4 million for the Community Services Block Grant allowing states to expand critical services, such as housing, home weatherization, parenting education, adult literacy classes, and emergency food assistance. And a down payment of \$75 million or 3.6 percent in child care assistance, the first increase in discretionary spending for this program in more than five years.

Mr. Chairman, this bill reflects a real commitment to our longstanding responsibilities and true fiscal responsibility. Each of us should support the FY08 Labor/HHS & Education bill—a bill each of us can take home and proudly share with our constituents.

We will accomplish a lot of good with this bill, but I especially want to highlight and commend Chairman OBEY, for the "Reducing the Need for Abortion Initiative" included in the bill, which parallels legislation spearheaded by Representative RYAN and myself.

With close to \$650 million in increased funding over last year and approximately \$1.4 billion for programs such as Title X, Healthy Start, teen pregnancy prevention, adoption awareness, after school programs, and child care programs for new parents attending college, just to name a few, we are promoting policies so critical to reducing the need for abortion in this country.

This bold initiative represents a considerable investment in preventing unintended pregnancies and supporting new parents. It is strong on prevention, strong on family income supports, and it makes clear that we are serious about addressing the issue of abortion head on. That, for all of us, it is a matter of conscience.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a Member of this subcommittee, its Members, and the work we have done this year. With this bill, we make opportunity real for millions of Americans and we give people the tools they need to grow and thrive tomorrow.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill and, in particular, its provisions to

help families obtain affordable housing with Section 8 vouchers and to help people with HIV/AIDS to secure housing with the assistance of the HOPWA program.

I want to thank the chairman for including \$300 million in this bill for Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS, the highest funding level ever for this program; and for providing \$403 million more than current funding for the Section 8 Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program. For years, we have had to fight for every nickel of funding and offer amendments for modest increases. It is a true pleasure to be working with a Chairman who better understands the needs of the American people and who is able to dedicate resources to areas of great need.

Rising housing costs and stagnating incomes have created serious housing affordability problems for growing numbers of low-income families. Years of Republican budget cuts have seriously damaged our public housing stock and forced thousands of people onto waiting lists for assistance. The list in NY grew so long that they stopped accepting applications. They have only recently announced their intention to reopen it, and they have been inundated by qualified people seeking help. To reduce the number of low-income families with severe housing affordability problems, it is critical that Congress increase Section 8 funding and resume funding for incremental vouchers, which I am pleased this bill does. The section 8 housing voucher program provides safe affordable housing to approximately 2 million American families in urban and rural communities in every State across our country. These vouchers are often the only resource for low-income families confronted by our Nation's affordable housing crisis.

In the past, my colleague Representative VELÁZQUEZ and I, often with the support of Chairman FRANK, have offered amendments that have passed with bipartisan support to increase the Section 8 program. We were successful in passing amendments in 2003, 2005, and 2006 to increase funding so that more families would be able to obtain affordable housing. While we can always do more and clearly there are still many unmet needs, I am pleased by the increases in today's bill.

[See Roll Call 267, 109th Congress 2nd Session (243–178), Roll Call 339, 109th Congress 1st Session (225–194), Roll Call 453, 108th Congress 1st Session (217–208)].

HOPWA is the only Federal housing program that specifically provides cities and states with the resources to address the housing crisis facing people living with HIV/AIDS. Americans living with HIV/AIDS are often forced to choose between expensive drug treatments and necessities such as housing. According to the National AIDS Housing Network, rates of new HIV diagnoses among the homeless are 16 times the rate in the general population, and HIV/AIDS death rates are five to seven times higher. People with AIDS who are homeless are more likely to be uninsured, use an emergency room, and be admitted to a hospital.

Inadequate housing is not only a barrier to treatment, but also puts people with HIV/AIDS at risk of premature death from exposure to other diseases, poor nutrition, stress and lack of medical care. Tragically, at any given time, one-third to one-half of all Americans with HIV/AIDS are either homeless or in imminent danger of becoming homeless.

There is a desperate need for HIV/AIDS housing, and HOPWA answers this need. By providing suitable, reasonably-priced housing, HOPWA enables cities and states to design and provide community-based, cost-effective housing for thousands of people living with HIV/AIDS and their families. It provides maximum flexibility so that states and communities can implement strategies that respond to local housing needs and shortfalls. In addition, the administrative costs of the program are capped, ensuring the money goes directly to serving people with HIV/AIDS.

Providing supportive housing is crucial to the well-being of thousands of people living with HIV/AIDS, and is a cost-effective approach to the AIDS housing crisis. Again, I thank the chairman for supporting HOPWA and Section 8.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEINER, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 558, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of California. In its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3074, to the Committee on Appropriations to report the same promptly with an amendment to prohibit the Department of Housing and Urban Development from deriving any portion of the \$1,300,000,000 rescission included in title II of the bill from

recaptures or other reductions of funds previously appropriated for the following:

(1) the Homeless Assistance Grants Program account (including funds provided to make grants to programs which assist homeless veterans);

(2) the Housing for Persons with Disability Program account (including funds provided for grants to programs which assist disabled veterans); and

(3) the Housing for the Elderly Program account.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, title II of the bill requires HUD to rescind \$1.3 billion in the funds that the Congress provided in 2007 or prior years. Frankly, HUD cannot meet this rescission without doing great harm to the most vulnerable of our population, those low-income individuals who are elderly, low-income, disabled persons and homeless families and individuals. As much as 40 percent of the homeless population in this country, Mr. Speaker, as much as 40 percent, are veterans.

Congress has always provided the section 8 program with full funding, knowing that if not all the funds were used, they would be recaptured and rescinded and used by the Congress for other high priority programs. However, this bill states categorically that if funds for the section 8 program are more than actually get used by the Public Housing Authority, they may not be recaptured or rescinded, even though they are clearly in excess.

Let me quote the report accompanying this bill: "The Department is not permitted to recapture these reserves for the rescission."

Just where is the Department expected to go to get these funds? The answer is very simple and very unfortunate. They would, first and foremost, eliminate funding for the construction of facilities that provide assisted living for low-income elderly persons, for low-income disabled individuals and homeless shelters, as well as other permanent housing for the homeless.

□ 2245

Let me repeat, other permanent housing for the homeless, as much as 40 percent of the homeless population are veterans.

These funds are not in excess. Quite to the contrary, they are very much in use. But construction programs spend out slowly and so the funds are there waiting to be applied towards various stages of construction. Unlike the section 8 funds, these funds would never be in excess. They are simply in the pipeline, fully obligated or committed to specific projects and ready for use.

So when HUD takes these funds, it means that facilities for these vulnerable groups will be eliminated. HUD has no other choices since there are no other programs with this much money still available from 2007 or prior years.

Mr. Speaker, however you look at it, this is a very bad outcome and every measure must be taken to prevent cut-

ting programs that serve the most vulnerable, especially programs that serve the homeless veterans. My motion to recommit does just that. It protects those programs from being slashed as sacrificial lambs to a new policy that says excess voucher funds are more important than building facilities to house the elderly and disabled and homeless, especially homeless veterans.

I urge a "yes" vote on this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the former chairman of the VA-HUD Subcommittee and a tireless advocate for housing programs that serve vulnerable populations.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I am entirely familiar with the long-standing practice of Congress to fully fund the section 8 voucher program to be sure all vouchers could be used but recognizing that this rarely happened and that excess funds would be recaptured and rescinded in the next fiscal year.

I am also very familiar with the fact that HUD programs serve the most vulnerable of our populations, and that veterans are one of the most impacted by the HUD programs in general, and especially the homeless program.

I was disappointed to hear that this cycle has been broken, that this Congress has decided that keeping the funds at the public housing authorities is more important than funding facilities for low-income elderly and disabled. But that is exactly what this bill does. It imposes a rescission of a magnitude that would be in excess of the section 8 program need each year, and then precludes the recapture of those funds. The report specifically tells HUD that section 8 funds are off limits for rescission or recapture.

To put this in perspective, section 8 voucher funding is 40 percent of HUD's entire project. So HUD is now forced to take the entire amount of the \$1.3 billion from a small universe of programs.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the motion to recommit and protect the poorest in our communities.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, there are two problems with the motion to recommit, one major and one tricky. First, I will take the major one. I want to point out to the Members of the House that the adoption of the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California will derail the bill. The motion instructs the committee to report the bill back promptly rather than forthwith. Unlike a motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith, a motion with other than forthwith instructions proposes to take the bill from the floor without reaching the question of passage.

Mr. Speaker, section 1002(b) of the House Manual states, "Unlike the case

of the motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith, the adoption of which occasions an immediate report to the floor, the adoption to a motion to recommit with instructions to report back other than forthwith sends the bill to committee whose eventual report, if any, would not be immediately before the House."

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this motion to recommit takes the bill off the floor. A vote against the motion will allow the bill to go forward to final passage. For that reason, I urge defeat of the motion to recommit.

Secondly, the bill before us includes a rescission of \$1.3 billion, which is exactly the same size that the President proposed for the 2008 budget and which is, in fact, lower than what was rescinded last year. HUD refuses to tell specifically where it will take the rescission from, but the President obviously believes that HUD can meet the rescission. The motion purports to disallow rescission from certain accounts, but HUD has traditionally not used those accounts, so the President must have believed that he could meet the rescission without rescinding funds from those three specific accounts.

So again, this one is the tricky one, and I would say that given the trickiness of it, that we should defeat the motion to recommit and go on to passage of the bill. For both reasons, I urge the Members to vote against recommitment of the bill.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Once again we are confronted with politics, not substance. The groans you hear are those of the self-indicted. If you were serious, if you were concerned about the veterans, if you were concerned about those in need, then this would be a substantive amendment subject to consideration now, not later, not tomorrow.

My friend will ask the rhetorical parliamentary question in a few minutes that he has asked every time we have done this, and every time this process is political only.

If it were substantive, I tell the gentleman from New York, if you wanted to accomplish this objective, you may get the votes on this side, but you will not get the votes on this side to kill this bill.

We have now taken 50 hours longer on consideration of appropriation bills than we did last year with unanimous consents from Mr. OBEY. You can groan, but the people who are looking for these funds, the people who want the benefits of this bill, the people who understand the work on both sides of the aisle that has gone into fashioning this bill, the people who have seen us vote on rejecting amendment after amendment on substantive grounds that you offered, and you could have offered this amendment, of course, as well, know full well this is a political process, not a substantive process. Reject this process. Let us move on with the business of the American people.

Let's do what they sent us here to do. Let's act. Reject this motion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that, if indeed this motion passed, this bill could be reported back to the committee it was assigned to and that bill could be reported back to the House tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk read the motion. The Chair is confident that the Members understand its portent. As affirmed by the Chair on May 24, 2000, and reaffirmed as recently as July 19, 2007, unlike a motion to recommit with instructions to report forthwith, a motion with "non-forthwith" instructions proposes to take the bill from the floor without reaching the question of passage.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that having reported this bill back to the committee from which it was designated, that it could be brought back to the floor as early as tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled and is not in a position to interpret the gentleman's understanding.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 220, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 714]

AYES—201

Aderholt	Blunt	Calvert
Akin	Boehner	Camp (MI)
Alexander	Bonner	Campbell (CA)
Altmire	Bono	Cannon
Bachmann	Boozman	Cantor
Baker	Boustany	Capito
Barrett (SC)	Brady (TX)	Carter
Barrow	Brown (SC)	Castle
Bartlett (MD)	Brown-Waite,	Chabot
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Coble
Biggart	Buchanan	Cole (OK)
Bilbray	Burgess	Conaway
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Buyer	Culberson

Davis (KY)	Keller	Pryce (OH)
Davis, David	King (NY)	Putnam
Davis, Tom	Kingston	Radanovich
Deal (GA)	Kirk	Ramstad
Dent	Kline (MN)	Regula
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Reichert
Doolittle	Lamborn	Renzi
Drake	Lampson	Reynolds
Dreier	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Duncan	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
English (PA)	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Everett	LoBiondo	Roskam
Fallin	Lucas	Royce
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Ferguson	E.	Sali
Flake	Mack	Saxton
Forbes	Manzullo	Schmidt
Fortenberry	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Fossella	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Fox	McCaul (TX)	Shadegg
Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Shays
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Shimkus
Gallegly	McHenry	Shuler
Garrett (NJ)	McHugh	Shuster
Gerlach	McKeon	Simpson
Gilchrest	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Gillmor	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Gingrey	McNerney	Smith (TX)
Gohmert	Mica	Souder
Goode	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Sullivan
Granger	Miller, Gary	Tancredo
Graves	Mitchell	Terry
Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Thornberry
Hastert	Murphy, Patrick	Tiahrt
Hastings (WA)	Murphy, Tim	Tiberi
Hayes	Musgrave	Turner
Heller	Myrick	Upton
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Walberg
Herger	Nunes	Walden (OR)
Hobson	Paul	Walsh (NY)
Hoekstra	Pearce	Wamp
Hulshof	Pence	Weldon (FL)
Hunter	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Inglis (SC)	Petri	Westmoreland
Issa	Pickering	Whitfield
Jindal	Pitts	Wicker
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Wilson (NM)
Johnson, Sam	Poe	Wilson (SC)
Jones (NC)	Porter	Wolf
Jordan	Price (GA)	Young (FL)

NOES—220

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Cuellar	Hirono
Allen	Cummings	Hodes
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Holden
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Holt
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hooley
Baird	Davis, Lincoln	Hoyer
Baldwin	DeFazio	Inslee
Bean	DeGette	Israel
Becerra	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Dicks	(TX)
Berry	Dingell	Jefferson
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Boren	Edwards	Kagen
Boswell	Ellison	Kanjorski
Boucher	Ellsworth	Kaptur
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Kennedy
Boyda (KS)	Engel	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Kilpatrick
Braley (IA)	Etheridge	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Farr	Klein (FL)
Butterfield	Fattah	Kucinich
Capps	Filner	Langevin
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Cardoza	Giffords	Larsen (WA)
Carnahan	Gillibrand	Larson (CT)
Carney	Gonzalez	Lee
Carson	Gordon	Levin
Castor	Green, Al	Lewis (GA)
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lipinski
Clay	Grijalva	Loebsack
Cleaver	Gutierrez	Lofgren, Zoe
Clyburn	Hall (NY)	Lowe
Cohen	Hare	Lynch
Conyers	Harman	Mahoney (FL)
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Mahoney (NY)
Costa	Hersteth Sandlin	Markey
Costello	Higgins	Matheson
Courtney	Hill	Matsui
Cramer	Hinche	McCarthy (NY)

McCollum (MN) Rahall Stark  
 McDermott Rangel Stupak  
 McGovern Reyes Sutton  
 McIntyre Rodriguez Tanner  
 McNulty Ross Tauscher  
 Meek (FL) Rothman Taylor  
 Meeks (NY) Roybal-Allard Thompson (CA)  
 Melancon Ruppertsberger Thompson (MS)  
 Michaud Rush  
 Miller (NC) Ryan (OH)  
 Miller, George Salazar  
 Mollohan Sanchez, Linda  
 Moore (KS) T.  
 Moore (WI) Sanchez, Loretta  
 Moran (VA) Sarbanes  
 Murphy (CT) Schakowsky  
 Murtha Schiff  
 Nadler Schwartz  
 Napolitano Scott (GA)  
 Neal (MA) Scott (VA)  
 Oberstar Serrano  
 Obey Sestak  
 Oliver Shea-Porter  
 Ortiz Sherman  
 Pallone Sires  
 Pascrell Skelton  
 Pastor Slaughter  
 Payne Smith (WA)  
 Perlmutter Snyder  
 Peterson (MN) Solis  
 Pomeroy Space  
 Price (NC) Spratt

## NOT VOTING—10

Bachus Davis, Jo Ann Marshall  
 Bishop (UT) Honda Young (AK)  
 Clarke King (IA)  
 Cubin LaHood

□ 2312

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 153, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 715]

## YEAS—268

Abercrombie Cleaver Frank (MA)  
 Ackerman Clyburn Gerlach  
 Allen Cohen Giffords  
 Altmire Conyers Gilchrist  
 Andrews Cooper Gillibrand  
 Arcuri Costa  
 Baca Courtney  
 Baird Cramer  
 Baker Crowley  
 Baldwin Cuellar  
 Barrow Cummings  
 Bean Davis (AL)  
 Becerra Davis (CA)  
 Berkley Davis (IL)  
 Berman Davis, Lincoln  
 Berry Davis, Tom  
 Bilbray DeFazio  
 Bishop (GA) DeGette  
 Bishop (NY) Delahunt  
 Blumenauer DeLauro  
 Boren Dent  
 Boswell Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Boucher Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Boyd (FL) Dicks  
 Boyda (KS) Dingell  
 Brady (PA) Doggett  
 Braley (IA) Donnelly  
 Brown, Corrine Doolittle  
 Butterfield Doyle  
 Capito Edwards  
 Capps Ellison  
 Capuano Ellsworth  
 Cardoza Emanuel  
 Carnahan Engel  
 Carney Eshoo  
 Carson Etheridge  
 Castle Farr  
 Castor Fattah  
 Chandler Ferguson  
 Clay Filner

Frank (MA)  
 Gerlach  
 Giffords  
 Gilchrist  
 Gillibrand  
 Gonzalez  
 Gordon  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (NY)  
 Hare  
 Harman  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hayes  
 Herseth Sandlin  
 Higgins  
 Hill  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Hobson  
 Hodes  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kagen

Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kirk  
 Klein (FL)  
 Knollenberg  
 Kucinich  
 Lampson  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loebsack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lynch  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHugh  
 McIntyre  
 McNerney  
 McNulty  
 Meek (FL)  
 Melancon  
 Michaud  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)

## NAYS—153

Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Bachmann  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Bartlett (MD)  
 Barton (TX)  
 Biggert  
 Bilirakis  
 Blackburn  
 Blunt  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Bono  
 Boozman  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Buchanan  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Calvert  
 Camp (MI)  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Carter  
 Chabot  
 Coble  
 Cole (OK)  
 Conaway  
 Costello  
 Crenshaw  
 Culberson  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis, David  
 Deal (GA)  
 Drake  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Ehlers  
 Emerson  
 English (PA)

Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Murtha  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Pomeroy  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Rodriguez  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Salazar  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shays  
 Shea-Porter

Sherman  
 Shuler  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Solis  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Space  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)

## NOT VOTING—10

Bachus Davis, Jo Ann Meeks (NY)  
 Bishop (UT) Honda Young (AK)  
 Clarke LaHood  
 Cubin Marshall

□ 2318

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# REPORT ON H.R. 3161, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. DELAURO, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-258) on the bill (H.R. 3161) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

## HONORING CAPTAIN CLYDE CAMPBELL

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, on Thursday evening, July 26, Gregg County, my home district, First District of Texas, will gather for a day of remembrance in honor of our great servicemembers who were held as prisoners of war or were missing in action.

July 26 is a special day because it will be the 63rd birthday of U.S. Air Force Captain Clyde Campbell, around whom this occasion is centered.

I, unfortunately, will be unable to attend since I will be here in Washington DC, but I send these remarks. Unfortunately, Captain Campbell will also be unable to make it on his own birthday celebration because he or his remains have not been brought home from Laos.

Clyde Campbell was born in Eagle Lake, Texas, in 1944, and graduated from Longview High School in 1962. After graduating from Texas A&M University, he answered the call to service and joined the United States Air Force. An ambitious and talented young pilot, Captain Campbell was stationed at Nakhon Phanom Royal Thai Airport Base in Thailand, ready to sacrifice his all for the Nation that he loved so dearly.

In March 1969, he took off in his Douglas A1 Skyraider on a bombing

pass, but Captain Campbell's plane was shot down and crashed in Laos.

I will speak more about Captain Campbell during Special Orders.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HIRONO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HONORING CAPTAIN CLYDE CAMPBELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, on Thursday evening, July 26, Gregg County, my home district, First District of Texas, will gather for a day of remembrance in honor of our great servicemembers who were held as prisoners of war or were missing in action.

July 26 is a special day because it would be the 63rd birthday of U.S. Air Force captain Clyde Campbell, that is the man around whom this occasion is centered.

I, unfortunately, will be unable to attend since I will be here in Washington. Unfortunately, Captain Campbell will also be unable to make it on his own birthday celebration because he or his remains have not been brought home from Laos.

Clyde Campbell was born in Eagle Lake, Texas, in 1944, and graduated from Longview High School in 1962. After graduating from Texas A&M University, he answered the call to service and joined the United States Air Force. An ambitious and talented young pilot, Captain Campbell was stationed at Nakhon Phanom Royal Thai Airport Base in Thailand, ready to sacrifice his all for the Nation that he loved so dearly.

In March 1969, he took off in his Douglas A1 Skyraider on a bombing pass, but Captain Campbell's plane was shot down and crashed in Laos.

It is now 2007, almost 40 years later. Although his crash site has been identified, Captain Campbell's remains are in a land that is not his home.

The Campbell family has spent nearly four decades requesting help to have this patriot returned. But so far, that help has not come. I am ashamed that the Federal Government has not used anywhere near the devotion to giving his family closure as the devotion Captain Campbell provided this Nation in her time of need.

This family deserves better. Captain Campbell deserves better, and I, as are many others around here, am determined to see that his remains are removed from Laos and given a proper burial here in the United States.

He and those who gave their last full measure of devotion for this country, as well as their beloved family members who have waited so long, deserve action, and they deserve results.

Captain Campbell and the Campbell family deserve our deepest gratitude for their sacrifice. May God bless them and comfort them, and may God and the Campbell family forgive this Federal Government for its 30 years of inadequate service to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ARMENIAN GENOCIDE—THE WAR TRIBUNALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, the denial of the Armenian genocide is an absurdity. Looking at the history of this catastrophic event from 1915 to 1918, it is impossible to deny that this was indeed genocide on all accounts.

One way to bear witness to the truth is to make reference to the war trials that took place immediately following the end of World War I. Looking at the substantial evidence and testimony gathered during these war trials proves that this was an indisputable genocide aimed at destroying a race of people.

Following the Ottoman Empire's defeat in World War I, a new government formed and accused its predecessor, Young Turk regime, of serious crimes. These accusations led to the court-martialing of the leadership of the Committee on Union and Progress, the party that had seized and held power since 1908.

Nearly 400 of the key government officials implicated in the atrocities committed against the Armenians were arrested. They were deported to Malta, where they were held while searches were made of archives in Istanbul, London, Paris, and Washington to investigate their actions. The charges included the unconstitutional seizure of power, wartime profiteering, and the massacre of Armenians.

At least six regional courts convened in provincial cities where massacres had occurred. The first recorded trial took place in Yozgat, charging three officials, including the governor, of mass murder of the Armenians of Ankara.

Testimony revealed Major Tevfik Bey, commander of the Yozgat mili-

tary police, had almost completely wiped out the Armenian population of Yozgat. It confirmed that the deportation of the Armenians was "a policy of extermination," and that the people were marched off with "arms and hands tied up" and later killed with "axes, spades, swords, knives and hatchets." Meanwhile, Governor Kemal told the captain that he had "made a vow on the honor of the prophet: I shall not leave a single Armenian alive in the sanjak of Yozgat."

The most famous trial took place in Istanbul in April 1919. There, 12 defendants, all members of the Committee on Union and Progress leadership and former ministers, were tried. Seven key figures, including Talat Pasha, Minister of Interior; Enver Pasha, Minister of War; and Cemal Pasha, Governor of Aleppo, had fled and they were tried in absentia. One authenticated secret telegram from July 17, 1915, quoted orders from Pasha that quoted: "The salvation of the country requires the elimination of the Armenians."

Even more evidence against these top officials was delivered in the key indictment which included 42 incriminating documents that had been gathered by the Mazhar Commission. These documents, such as telegrams, memos, statements, and depositions all confirmed that the campaign to exterminate the Armenians was premeditated and deliberate.

Some of the accused were found guilty of the charges. There were three hangings and numerous convictions. Most significantly, the ruling triumvirate of Young Turks consisting of Mehmed Talaat, Ismail Enver, and Ahmed Djemal, were condemned to death. They, however, eluded justice by fleeing abroad. Many more of the convicted did not serve out their prison sentences, and a majority of the perpetrators escaped punishment after a prisoner exchange deal. To this day, there is still no justice for the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Madam Speaker, I wish to express my support for swift passage of House Resolution 106, which reaffirms the Armenian genocide. It now has 224 cosponsors, a majority of the House. As the first genocide of the 20th century, it is morally imperative that we remember this atrocity and collectively demand reaffirmation of this crime against humanity.

We must stand up and recognize the tragic events that began in 1915 for what they were, the systematic elimination of the people. By recognizing these actions as genocide, we can renew our commitment to prevent such atrocities from ever occurring again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CODEL TO IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 14 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor of the House tonight having just returned from the country of Iraq yesterday afternoon. And even given the lateness of the hour, I wanted to come address the House because there are some issues that are, in fact, very timely and time-sensitive, and I thought it was important to get them spoken on the floor of the House.

My intention is to come back with the other Members who were on the trip with me, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and talk about this in some depth in the weeks to come. Mr. KING of Iowa was also with us on the trip. But because of the late-

ness tonight and the lateness that we are likely to go tomorrow night and Thursday night, it may be next week before we can actually do that formal presentation, and there were some things that I wanted to get on the floor of the House this week.

Madam Speaker, I would report to the House that as of the third week of July 2007, it is still a very mixed report about the situation in Iraq. My overall impression from this latest trip is that significant successes have occurred and are likely to continue to occur as far as returning control of the country to the Iraqi Government and delivering it out of the hands of criminals and murderers. At the same time, it is still a very dangerous situation, and the sacrifice is very real.

Madam Speaker, the future of America is vastly different depending upon the outcome of what happens in the country of Iraq. A stable country, a country with a representational government, a country able to act as a partner for peace in the Middle East would be vastly preferable to a lawless land ruled by terrorists and criminals providing a base for training operations and, Madam Speaker, a source for funding for further enlargement of their activities.

Almost without question, the divergent future was on the minds of almost everyone I talked with during the 2-day trip. Certainly America's best interest is going to be served by stability in that country and with their active participation in stabilizing a very troubled region.

It has been just over a year since I last traveled to Iraq. A lot has changed both at home and in Iraq over that time. There is no question that the news reports coming out of Iraq have almost been universally pessimistic for about 10 months' time. I was obviously very concerned about what I would encounter upon my return to that country, but the trip made over the weekend, a Saturday and Sunday, a very condensed time frame with a great deal to see, we learned a great deal.

Starting with a 2 a.m. departure from the military airport in Kuwait City, we loaded on the C-130 for the flight into Baghdad. The plane was cramped and fully loaded. Already at 2:00 in the morning, it was over 90 degrees. The plane contained a large number of soldiers and marines who were returning to Baghdad. Because of the very early hour and the loudness of the aircraft, there was not much time for conversation; but after the plane landed and the engines were stopped, there was a brief episode where conversation was possible.

For most, this was their second or third rotation. Their deployments had been extended through 15 months, and most would not go home for almost a year from that point. When several who were standing next to me learned who I was, there was obviously an eagerness for conversation.

Since February, there has been a change in how they have done their

work. Now most were placed alongside Iraqi soldiers in smaller groups around town. They were no longer attached to the larger, more protected bases, and the soldiers were clearly seeing a greater amount of activity, and it concerned them.

I spoke in some depth with the soldier in front of me. He had 10 months left in his rotation, and sometimes he wondered if the generals knew what they were up against in this deployment. He complained about the long hours and the heat. He complained about being separated from his family. He had been reading a book on the plane, and I asked him about this. He said it was a book about philosophy, so I naturally assumed that upon leaving the Army at the end of his deployment, he would likely return to school, or perhaps he had a job waiting for him, and I asked him about this. He looked at me strangely. "Well, I just reenlisted for 5 years," he said tersely.

We left the plane and parted ways. He got on an armored convoy, and we were loaded in Blackhawk helicopters for the next leg of our trip down to Ramadi. It was still very early in the morning, and the sun was barely breaking through the low dust layer that always seems to hang over Baghdad in the summer. The temperature was already in excess of 100 degrees, but in many ways my conversation with this soldier underscored the ambiguities, the inconsistencies, and the incongruous nature of life in Iraq.

Over the next 48 hours, we would see stories of great heroism and great hope. At the same time, the frustration of buying time and space for a young government, sometimes a dysfunctional government, of a war-torn country was underscored at several junctures.

From a military perspective, success has been made and continues to be made on a near daily basis. Indeed, the primary enemy, al Qaeda, has not only been beaten, but vanquished every time there has been an encounter. And because of the increased military activity, the encounters have been more frequent. At the same time, a very young government seems to have already developed entrenched bureaucracies because of the centralized nature of the government in Iraq. As military successes are happening around the country, aid from the central government is slow to be dispatched out to the outlying communities.

As is probably the case with every other conflict in our Nation's history, there are widely distributed data points, and one can take one or two of these and make virtually any argument that one wishes to make. It takes a more disciplined outlook to analyze the data, look at the trendlines, but that is a discipline that must be exercised.

Madam Speaker, the city of Ramadi in the al-Anbar Province in Western Iraq was the first stop for us on Saturday. This is a city the size of Fort



Worth, Texas, back in my home district. One year ago when I was in Iraq, Ramadi was held by insurgent representatives of al Qaeda. In July of 2006, there would have been no way for a congressional delegation to travel to this city as it would have been seen as too dangerous a mission.

But things began to change last February. The historic tribal leaders began to clearly understand that life alongside al Qaeda was not going to improve; and in a stunning reversal, the town's leaders began to seek out and embrace American protection. Popular support was now no longer available to al Qaeda in a city that had been destined to be the provincial capital of the resurgent Caliphate. This represented a striking strategic failure for the enemy. Their shadow government which had intended to establish a capital of a radical Islamic state was forced out of the city, and, indeed, subsequent armed attempts to retake control were successfully repelled. People in town began identifying where the terrorists lived, who was making the bombs, who was putting the city and their daily lives in jeopardy.

Now, the task of rebuilding a civil society, the municipal government has certainly significant tasks ahead of it. And, Madam Speaker, I might add to that it was the additional soldiers and marines provided by what is called the surge last February, particularly the soldiers of the 2nd Marine Expeditionary Unit force just north of al-Anbar, that made a lot of this possible. They intercepted the vehicle-borne improvised explosive devices as they were on their way down to Ramadi; they found the factories where these were manufactured, and were able to provide additional breathing space and additional room as the city was recon- trolled by the Americans.

Because of the distance from Baghdad and the central government, there has been some isolation, and significant efforts have been made by the Army to ensure that the local mayor has the ability to provide for his citizens. And this, Madam Speaker, underscores one of the real difficulties ahead for this country. As areas are reclaimed and stabilized, the central government must be able to quickly provide the financial and security support that will be required to sustain this early success.

This also underscores one of the important recognized benchmarks, that of holding the provincial elections. During the electoral process 2 years ago, most of the Sunni population was involved in an electoral boycott. Now they see the fundamental error of that decision, and they are eager to see new elections that would permit a more popular representation.

After 2 or 3 years of serious brutality at the hands of al Qaeda, the population now sees America as helpers and sees Americans as protectors. The tribal leaders had originally feared that Americans were occupiers, that they

would stay forever, but now they have come to understand that the Americans have no such interests. The same could not be said for al Qaeda's interests. Their clear intent was to hold the town for their purposes for the foreseeable future.

The point was made during our visit that there are no overnight solutions to the problems in Iraq. Leadership cannot be bought, and this has to be an evolutionary change. But this change can occur if the correct environment is provided.

As if to underscore the recent success in Ramadi, we were taken out of the military base, down the main street of town, right into the marketplace. We were permitted to walk freely in the marketplace and observed many of the items for sale in what appears to be a very normal Arab market.

Madam Speaker, I did provide a photograph from that visit, and here you can see again one of the stalls of the market. You can see the goods for sale, the pots and pans up there, coolers for water or whatever other beverage one might want to have. You can see the smiles on the young children. They didn't know we were going to come to town that day; it just happened that we showed up, and they were apparently glad to see us. You see the men there bargaining in the background. It doesn't really look like a street scene of people that are under great stress or duress. It looks like a normal marketplace with normal people doing normal Saturday-morning activities.

The vehicle you see just a portion up here at the edge of the photograph was actually a municipal vehicle, a city vehicle. They were repairing one of the sewer lines in the street. Many of the sewer lines and water lines in this town had been broken by improvised explosive devices that had gone off during the more active and kinetic phases of the retaking of the city from the al Qaeda groups. But it wasn't Americans who were out repairing the sewer pipe, it was actually the municipal government of the city of Ramadi who was taking care of that task, as they should, as is appropriate for a municipal government, the appropriate way for a municipal government to behave.

I would also point out some of the clothing that is for sale.

Madam Speaker, I just have to say in this trip to Iraq one of the things I saw that really struck me as being significantly different from other trips, not just in Ramadi, but in Baghdad and some of the other areas we visited, many more women were in evidence out on the streets and out in public, significantly different from other times when I have been there. And I take that as a good sign, a good sign as for the resurgence of civil society.

But there is pretty striking evidence of the prior combat in the town all around us. But the evidence of active reconstruction and a crew working on the sewer line in the middle of the street as we walked through town real-

ly again gave me some hope that there was some stability for these young children.

And let me talk about the future for a moment. That is a future that these young men now have that actually was going to be denied to them just a few short months ago. And, again, you can see the look of curiosity on these boys' faces. This boy is not quite sure whether to smile or run away. But, nevertheless, these kids were all over in the marketplace.

And you see back there again some of the brightly colored glass and things that weren't for sale in the market. I don't know where these shirts came from; presumably that represents some sort of local sports team. But, again, a very different scene in Ramadi today than would have been evident a year ago.

When I returned yesterday, one of the things that I encounter in the headline in the Washington Times was also of encouragement to me. We had spent some time during the trip on Saturday at a place called Camp Taji, which is north of Iraq.

□ 2345

Camp Taji is where a good number of our soldiers are stationed, a lot of our National Guardsmen are stationed. And again, Camp Taji, the same situation: they've moved soldiers out the relatively large base. They've moved out to work with the Iraqi units, to work in the towns. And one of the things we learned on that trip through there this weekend, the commander told us that there had just been a meeting with 150 sheiks, both Sunni and Shia, and the reason for the meeting, the meeting was called by the sheiks. They wanted to meet with the American military, and the reason for that meeting was they wanted this same type of success for their communities. They wanted to ask if the same type of return to civil society that is going on, that's breaking out in the country of Ramadi, they wanted to know if it was possible in their communities. And, again, not just Sunni leaders, Shia leaders as well.

And I'll quote from yesterday's, this is the Washington Times from Monday, July 23, 2007. And it says: "U.S. forces have brokered an agreement between Sunni and Shia tribal leaders to join forces against al Qaeda and other extremists extending a policy that has transformed the security situation in western Anbar province, and they wanted to extend that to this area north of the capital."

A startling story. We just heard about this on Saturday when we were there. In fact, I was kind of given the impression that it was so new that maybe we shouldn't talk about it. But here it is on the front page of the Washington Times, so I'm going to assume it is okay to bring that up. Very significant because, of course, in the Sunni areas of Iraq, al Qaeda's dominant. In the Shia areas the Mahdi

Army from Maktadar al Sadr was dominant. Neither one of these groups is seen as really furthering the common interests of the country of Iraq, and both Sunni and Shia were asking for help from the Americans.

Another headline that greeted me Monday morning when I woke up in Germany on the way back, one of the generals, General Mixon, has proposed a shift in strategy in Iraq. He says, they're so calm up north, maybe we should be able to bring some of our troops from up north down to the areas around Baghdad to provide additional security there because, quite frankly, they're not needed in Nineveh province. They're not needed in these areas where just a year ago there was significant terrorist activity occurring and United States troops were required.

Madam Speaker, you have been very generous with the time. I hope to be back here next week with the other members of the congressional delegation that went to Iraq. We'll talk a great deal more about this subject, but some of these issues were time sensitive and I wanted to get them on the record while they were still very relevant.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and July 23 on account of illness.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for July 23 on account of attending the State of Northern Kentucky address.

Mr. PENCE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of family medical reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGESS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, July 31.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 31.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1856. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to make technical corrections to the new border tunnels and passages of fence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July, 25, 2007, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2623. A letter from the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of intent to obligate funds for three additional projects for the Fiscal Year 2007 Foreign Comparative Testing (FCT) Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2624. A letter from the Acting Deputy Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the decision to convert to contract the aircraft line maintenance functions in China Lake, CA; Lemoore, CA; San Diego, CA; Jacksonville, FL; Mayport, FL; Patuxent River, MD; Norfolk, VA; Virginia Beach, VA; and Oak Harbour, WA, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2625. A letter from the Chief, Congressional Action Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of the decision to initiate a multi-function standard competition of the Noncore Enterprise Communications Function at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2626. A letter from the Chief, Congressional Action Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of the decision to initiate a multi-function standard competition of the Core Enterprise Communications Function at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2627. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's Report to Congress on the Plutonium Storage at the Department of Energy's Savannah River Site, pursuant to Public Law 107-314, section 3183; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2628. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel Stephen R. Lanza to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2629. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the omission of the SSN from the Department of Defense military identification cards, pursuant to Public Law 109-364, section 585; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2630. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of De-

fense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2631. A letter from the Director, National Defense Research Institute, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "F-22A Multi-Year Procurement Program: An Assessment of Cost Savings," pursuant to Public Law 109-364, section 134; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2632. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the quarterly report of obligations and outlays of FY 2004, FY 2005 and FY 2006 funds under the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief through September 30, 2006, pursuant to Division D, Pub. L. 108-199; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2633. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 073-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2634. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Government of Belgium (Transmittal No. RSAT-01-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2635. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313, a report prepared by the Department of State on the progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 2007 through May 31, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2636. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2637. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, transmitting the 2006 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2638. A letter from the Legislative Counsel, Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, "To clarify the authorities for the use of certain National Park Service properties within Golden Gate National Recreational Area and San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2639. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, A340-200, and A340-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27013; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-236-AD; Amendment 39-15022; AD 2007-08-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2640. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EADS SOCATA Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26233; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-63-AD; Amendment

39-14979; AD 2007-05-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2641. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Redmond, OR [Docket No. FAA-2006-25997; Airspace Docket No. 06-ANM-5] received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2642. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Head Restraints [Docket No. NHTSA-2007-27986] (RIN: 2127-AJ96) received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2643. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fire Penetration Resistance of Thermal/Acoustic Insulation Installed on Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24277; Amendment No. 121-330] (RIN: 2120-AI75) received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2644. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reporting of Early Warning Information [Docket No. NHTSA-2006-25653; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127-AJ94) received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2645. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27898; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-078-AD; Amendment 39-15029; AD 2007-07-05 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2646. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; LATINOAMERICANA DE AVIACION (LAVIA) S.A. (Type Certificate Data Sheets No. 2A8 and No. 2A10 previously held by The New Piper Aircraft, Inc.) Models PA-25, PA-25-235, and PA-25-260 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27109; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-005-AD; Amendment 39-15024; AD 2007-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2647. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Models HP.137 Jetstream Mk.1, Jetstream Series 200, Jetstream Series 3101, and Jetstream Model 3201 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27070 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-003-AD; Amendment 39-15023; AD 2007-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2648. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-27824; Directorate Identifier 2003-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-15026; AD 2006-11-05R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2649. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness

Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-601, A300 B4-603, A300 B4-605R, A300 C4-605R Variant F, A310-204, and A310-304 Airplanes Equipped with General Electric CF6-80C2 Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-27012; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-188-AD; Amendment 39-15017; AD 2007-07-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2650. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CT7-5, -7, and -9 Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-20944; Directorate Identifier 2003-NE-64-AD; Amendment 39-15018; AD 2007-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2651. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McCauley Propeller Systems Models 3A32C406/82NDB-X and D3A32C409/82NDB-X Propellers [Docket No. FAA-2005-22898; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-10-AD; Amendment 39-15021; AD 2007-08-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2652. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 45 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27980; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-15033; AD 2007-09-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2653. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company (The Beech Aircraft Company and BEECH previously held Type Certificate Nos. 3A15, 3A16, 5A3, and A-777) Models 35-33, 35-A33, 35-B33, 35-C33, E33, F33, G33, 35-C33A, E33A, F33A, E33C, F33C, 35, A35, B35, C35, D35, E35, F35, G35, H35, J35, K35, M35, N35, P35, S35, V35, V35A, V35B, 36, A36, A45, (T-34A, B45), D45 (T-34B), 95-55, 95-A55, 95-B55, 95-B55A, 95-B55B (T-42A), 95-C55, 95-C55A, D55, D55A, E55, E55A, 56TC, A56TC, 58, 95, B95, B95A, D95A, and E95 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26075; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-55-AD; Amendment 39-15025; AD 2007-08-08] to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2654. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 172R, 172S, 182T, T182T, 206H, and T206H Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27709; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-028-AD; Amendment 39-15020; AD 2007-08-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2655. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters Inc. (MDHI) Model MD600N Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-27343; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-05-AD; Amendment 39-15030; AD 2007-05-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2656. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers Model SD3-60 SHERPA, SD3-SHERPA, SD3-30, and SD3-60 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27866; Direc-

torate Identifier 2007-NM-055-AD; Amendment 39-15027; AD 2007-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2657. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25419; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-055-AD; Amendment 39-15007; AD 2007-07-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2658. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 182H, 182J, 182K, 182L, 182M, 182N, 182P, 182Q, and 182R Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27786; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-15031; AD 2007-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2659. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 Airplanes and Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27014; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-253-AD; Amendment 39-15041; AD 2007-09-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2660. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a semi-annual report concerning emigration laws and policies of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan, as required by Sections 402 and 409 of the 1974 Trade Act, as amended, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. DELAURO: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3161. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. FOX, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ISSA, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. KUH of New York, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SHAYS,

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3138. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to update the definition of electronic surveillance; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. WATT):

H.R. 3139. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Perquimans River and its tributaries in Perquimans County, North Carolina, for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas (for herself, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 3140. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure and foster continued beneficiary access to generic drugs under the Medicaid Program by setting pharmacy reimbursement based on retail acquisition cost and to promote the use of generic drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 3141. A bill to increase the amount in certain funding agreements relating to patents and nonprofit organizations to be used for scientific research, development, and education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3142. A bill to provide law enforcement critical tools and resources for preventing and enforcing violent crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 3143. A bill to eliminate methamphetamine kingpins; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3144. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for sex offenders who access social networks on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DRAKE:

H.R. 3145. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase criminal penalties for certain removed aliens who illegally reenter the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 3146. A bill to provide additional tools and resources to combat terrorism financing; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently de-

termined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 3147. A bill to provide additional tools and tough penalties to fight terrorism and protect America's national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

H.R. 3148. A bill to eliminate child pornography; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 3149. A bill to protect children from sex offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 3150. A bill to increase and enhance law enforcement resources committed to investigation and prosecution of violent gangs, to deter and punish violent gang crime, to reform and facilitate prosecution of juvenile gang members who commit violent crimes, to expand and improve gang prevention programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 3151. A bill to authorize grants to establish and improve criminal forensic laboratories; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3152. A bill to provide funding for multi-jurisdictional anti-gang task forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 3153. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide to make the killing of a law enforcement officer an aggravating factor for the imposition of the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H.R. 3154. A bill to deter alien smuggling criminal enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3155. A bill to amend titles 17 and 18, United States Code, to strengthen the protection of intellectual property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 3156. A bill to control violent crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 3157. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act relating to the statute of limitations that applies to certain claims; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 3158. A bill to provide that 8 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee under subchapter V of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, shall be paid leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HARE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 3159. A bill to mandate minimum periods of rest and recuperation for units and members of the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces between deployments for Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 3160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent corporations from exploiting tax treaties to evade taxation of United States income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 3162. A bill to amend titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the children's health insurance program, to improve beneficiary protections under the Medicare, Medicaid, and the CHIP program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 3163. A bill to provide affordable, guaranteed private health coverage that will make Americans healthier and can never be taken away; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 3164. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of Indian tribal governments as State

governments for purposes of issuing tax-exempt governmental bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. FORTUÑO):

H.R. 3165. A bill to amend the General Notes of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to certain products imported from United States insular possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 3166. A bill to reauthorize the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 3167. A bill to impose a temporary moratorium on the discharge of members of the Armed Forces for personality disorder, except in certain specified cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3168. A bill to establish an educational mentoring pilot program for at-risk youth through community partnerships that provides life, social, academic and vocational skills necessary for youth to become productive law abiding citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 3169. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to respond to election administration needs which result from a major natural disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 3170. A bill to make permanent the individual income tax rates for capital gains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. EHLERS):

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", the document-sized, annotated version of the United States Constitution, and the pocket version of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on House Administration, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HALL of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Purple Heart Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALLI (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. DRAKE, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H. Res. 565. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for division of the question on the legislative proposals involved to allow separate votes on disparate matters; to the Committee on Rules.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
H.R. 35: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 89: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 211: Mr. ALTMIRE.  
H.R. 303: Mr. BERRY and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 325: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 579: Mr. BARROW and Mr. KELLER.  
H.R. 601: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.  
H.R. 734: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 748: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 808: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
H.R. 900: Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 963: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 969: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 1023: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SNYDER, and Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 1043: Mr. BOSWELL.  
H.R. 1064: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 1078: Mr. TERRY.  
H.R. 1093: Mr. REYES and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1108: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.  
H.R. 1125: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FARR, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1134: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1228: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
H.R. 1280: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 1302: Ms. CARSON.  
H.R. 1304: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1313: Ms. WATSON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 1357: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WALSH of New York, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1376: Ms. BERKLEY.  
H.R. 1384: Mr. BACA and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 1399: Mr. BUYER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 1400: Mr. DICKS.  
H.R. 1415: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1416: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. DELAHUNT.  
H.R. 1422: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1459: Mr. MATHESON.  
H.R. 1474: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 1514: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.  
H.R. 1534: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1553: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1576: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. WAMP.  
H.R. 1653: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1742: Mr. HAYES and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1746: Mr. FORTUÑO and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
H.R. 1766: Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 1818: Mr. OLVER and Mr. BOREN.  
H.R. 1823: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1843: Mr. PLATTS.  
H.R. 1845: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1927: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 1940: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1941: Mr. WYNN and Mr. TIBERI.  
H.R. 1943: Ms. CARSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1981: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
H.R. 2017: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2020: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 2053: Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MACK, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2060: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
H.R. 2090: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 2095: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 2116: Mr. TURNER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2122: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 2126: Mr. WEXLER.  
H.R. 2164: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 2184: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BERRY.  
H.R. 2205: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2221: Ms. WATSON.  
H.R. 2231: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 2262: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HODES, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2265: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 2290: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.  
H.R. 2295: Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2302: Mr. FORBES.  
H.R. 2329: Mr. PETRI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. INSLEE, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 2332: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WALSH of New York, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2347: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2390: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
H.R. 2502: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2516: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2539: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.  
H.R. 2549: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 2566: Mr. COHEN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 2599: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.  
H.R. 2611: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 2612: Mr. BOUCHER.  
H.R. 2639: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 2668: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 2694: Mr. CLAY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2727: Mr. STUPAK.  
H.R. 2740: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2743: Mr. ROHRBACHER.  
H.R. 2768: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2769: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2787: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2799: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. POE.

H.R. 2800: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2805: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2818: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FARR, Mr. HODES, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BACA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LOEBBACH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 2896: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H.R. 2902: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2905: Mr. FORBES and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2910: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 2914: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2927: Mr. CARTER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELLER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. DENT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2929: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2991: Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HENSARLING, and Ms. HOOLEY.

H.R. 3007: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 3008: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 3035: Ms. CARSON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 3040: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 3042: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3046: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3053: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3054: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 3087: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3099: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3121: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3124: Ms. HIRONO.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Con. Res. 133: Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. GINGREY and Mr. FORTUÑO.

H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. CARNEY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 187: Mr. STUPAK.

H. Res. 32: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H. Res. 55: Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 111: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SIREs, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H. Res. 143: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 235: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H. Res. 282: Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 303: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SHULER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BERRY, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. MAHONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 333, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 405: Ms. WATSON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Res. 420: Mr. POE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr.

FLAKE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. GORDON.

H. Res. 433: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 457: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 470: Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Res. 508: Mr. WYNN and Mr. BOEHNER.

H. Res. 539: Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 548: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 549: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H. Res. 555: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BACA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FARR, Ms. CARSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. REYES, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 557: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2419

OFFERED BY: Mr. MANZULLO

AMENDMENT No. 1: Strike page 266, line 23, through page 267, line 10, and insert the following:

“(a) PAYMENTS FOR CONSERVATION PRACTICES.—The total amount of payments that a person or a legal entity (except a joint venture or a general partnership) may receive, directly or indirectly, in any fiscal year shall not exceed—

“(1) \$60,000 from any single program under this title (other than the environmental quality incentives program) or as agricultural management assistance under section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 524(b));

“(2) \$125,000 from more than one program under this title (other than the environmental quality incentives program) or as agricultural management assistance under section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; or

“(3) \$450,000 from the environmental quality incentives program.

H.R. 3704

OFFERED BY: Mr. JORDAN

AMENDMENT No. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Total appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$3,200,000,000.

H.R. 3074

OFFERED BY: Mr. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 29: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. 410. None of the funds in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

H.R. 3074

OFFERED BY: Mr. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide homeownership assistance for applicants described in 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

H.R. 3074

OFFERED BY: Mr. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 31: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to implement the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (relating to wage rate requirements; commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act).

H.R. 3074

OFFERED BY: Mr. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN).

H.R. 3074

OFFERED BY: Mr. MCHENRY

AMENDMENT No. 33: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to award a grant or contract based on the race, ethnicity, or sex of the applicant or prospective contractor or subcontractor.

H.R. 3074

OFFERED BY: Mrs. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT No. 34: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$253,690,000.

H.R. 3074

OFFERED BY: Mr. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 35: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act for the mortgage insurance programs under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) may be used for any housing trust fund established under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 17271 et seq.).

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: Mrs. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT No. 21: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

## TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to initiate a civil action, or participate in a civil action initiated after the date of enactment of this act, by or on the behalf of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission against an entity on the grounds that the entity requires an employee to speak English while engaged in work.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: Mr. ENGLISH OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT No. 22: Page 11, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: Mr. GINGREY

AMENDMENT No. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

## TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Director of the



Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to pay the compensation of employees of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to test and examine firearms without written and published testing standards.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MR. JORDAN

AMENDMENT No. 24: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

**TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 701. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 6.0 percent.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MR. PENCE

AMENDMENT No. 25: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new title:

**TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 701. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the amendments made by subtitle A of title II of Public Law 107-155.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 26: Page 16, line 20, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 65, line 21, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT No. 27: Page 11, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$16,000,000)”.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MR. CAPUANO

AMENDMENT No. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

**TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 701. For grants for young witness assistance, as authorized by section 1136 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162), and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for “Department of Justice, General Administration, Salaries and Expenses” is hereby reduced by, \$3,000,000.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MS. SUTTON

AMENDMENT No. 29: Page 85, add the following after line 24:

**TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 701. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the United States Trade Representative for any lobbying activities, or any lobbying activities that are coordinated with private interests, for the purpose of influencing Members of Congress or the public to support or oppose a legislative proposal or free trade agreement that is pending before the Congress.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MS. SUTTON

AMENDMENT No. 30: Page 85, add the following after line 24:

**TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 701. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any free trade agreement that enters into force after the enactment of this Act unless the United States Trade Representative has certified that jobs in the United States will not be lost because of the agreement.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MS. SUTTON

AMENDMENT No. 31: Page 70, line 17, insert the following before the period: “: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, at least \$10,000,000 shall be used only to reduce the barriers to exports of United States goods and services identified in the 2007 National Trade Estimates report, giving priority to those barriers that result in the greatest opportunities for United States goods and services: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in the preceding proviso may be used to negotiate any free trade agreement, with any country, that has not been signed by the parties before the date of enactment of this Act”.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MS. SUTTON

AMENDMENT No. 32: Page 70, line 17, insert the following before the period: “: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, at least \$1,000,000 shall be used only for monitoring, enforcement, and oversight of trade laws and rules relating to the People’s Republic of China”.

H.R. 3093

OFFERED BY: MS. ZOE LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 33: Page 16, line 20, strike “\$58,693,000” (reduced by \$7,500,000).

Page 21, line 7, strike “\$104,777,000” (reduced by \$20,000,000).

Page 30, line 10, strike “\$33,191,000” (reduced by \$7,500,000).

Page 42, line 8, strike “\$1,315,000,000” (increased by \$40,000,000).

Page 43, line 3, strike “\$405,000,000” (increased by \$40,000,000).